



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





600015108J

50.58g.

1365 d. 12



AN EXPOSITION

OF THE

THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES.

•

•

•

Cambridge :
Printed at the University Press.

AN EXPOSITION
OF THE
THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES,
HISTORICAL AND DOCTRINAL.

**BEING THE SUBSTANCE OF A COURSE OF LECTURES DELIVERED
TO CANDIDATES FOR ORDERS AT ST. DAVID'S COLLEGE,
LAMPETER.**

BY

EDW. HAROLD BROWNE, M.A.,
PREBENDARY OF EXETER AND VICAR OF KENWYN,
FORMERLY FELLOW AND TUTOR OF EMMAUEL COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,
AND VICE-PRINCIPAL AND PROFESSOR OF HEBREW AT LAMPETER.

VOLUME I.

•
LONDON:
JOHN W. PARKER, WEST STRAND.

M.DCCC.L.



TO
THE RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,
CONNOP,

LORD BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S
AND VISITOR OF ST. DAVID'S COLLEGE,

IN
AFFECTIONATE GRATITUDE
FOR UNSOUGHT AND UNEXPECTED KINDNESS,

AND

WITH DEEP RESPECT

FOR PROFOUND INTELLECT AND HIGH CHRISTIAN INTEGRITY,

THE FOLLOWING PAGES

ARE DEDICATED BY

HIS LORDSHIP'S

ATTACHED AND FAITHFUL SERVANT,

THE AUTHOR.

ADVERTISEMENT.

AT the earnest and most kindly expressed desire of the Students at St. David's College immediately preparing for Holy Orders, the following pages, the substance of a course of Academic Lectures, have been prepared for the press.

The Historical Sections embrace so much of the history of the subject as, it was hoped, would enable the Student to understand the general drift and importance of the Article. The references have been made, as far as possible, to popular and well-known books, for the greater convenience of the general or the younger reader. Where the Author has been led to a passage by a quotation elsewhere, he has generally given a double reference.

From residence in remote parts of the kingdom, he has sometimes been unable to quote from the best editions.

The edition, when necessary, has been specified.

He has aimed to be simple as far as was consistent with being sound, to avoid private or party views, and to take little notice of the controversies of the day.

ERRATA.

- Page 124, line 12 from bottom, *for sua read sua*
250 note, line 3 from bottom, *for ut read at*
204, line 7, *after in insert one*
204 note, last line but one, *for 251 read 351*
354, line 27, *after works insert on men*
374 note, line 3, *for 'Inσoûs read 'Inσoû*
380 note, last line but one, *for Confessionem read Confessionum*
471 note, *for Xith read IXth*

INTRODUCTION.

THE Reformation was not the work either of a year or of a generation. Its foundation was laid both in the good and in the evil qualities of our nature. Love of truth, reverence for sacred things, a sense of personal responsibility, a desire for the possession of full spiritual privileges, co-operated with the pride of human reason, the natural impatience of restraint, and the envy and hatred inspired among the nobles by a rich and powerful hierarchy, to make the world weary of the Papal domination, and desirous of reform in things spiritual and ecclesiastical.

Wickliffe in England, and Huss and Jerom of Prague in Germany, had long ago given utterance to a feeling which lay deep in the hearts, and spread wide among the ranks of thinking men. It was said of Wickliffe, that half of the secular priests in England agreed with him; and his followers long gave serious trouble both to Church and State. On the Continent, the Bohemian Church was rent by faction; and even open war was the result of an obstinate denial of the Cup in the Lord's Supper to the lay-members of Christ's Church. The two great councils of Constance (A. D. 1415) and Basle (A. D. 1431) were the results of the general call for a reformation of abuses; and they left them where they were, or aggravated and strengthened them.

But there was a leaven which could not be prevented from working. The revival of letters and the art of printing taught men how to think, and how to communicate their thoughts. Men, whose character was almost purely literary, contributed not a little to pull down the system which threatened to stifle learning by confounding it with heresy. Amongst these, on every account the most important and influential was Erasmus. It is thought by many that his Biblical criticism and his learned wit did more to rouse men to reform than the honest but headlong zeal of Luther. At least, if there had been no Erasmus to precede him, Luther's voice, if it could not have been stilled, might soon have been stifled. He might not have found both learning and power zealous to protect him, so that he could defy and prove superior to the allied forces of the Emperor and the Pope. But Erasmus was himself alarmed at the spirit he had raised. He had been zealous for reformation; but he dreaded destruction. And he was the type of many, more in earnest than himself. On both sides of the great controversy, which soon divided Europe into two hostile communities, were many, who wished to have abuses eradicated, but who feared to see the fabric of ages shaken to its centre. Some, like Erasmus, remained in communion with Rome; others, like Melancthon, joined the Reformation. The distance in point of sentiment between the more moderate men; thus by force of circumstances arrayed in opposition to each other, was probably but very small. But in the ranks of both parties there were many of a more impetuous and less compromising spirit: and as the voice of a community is generally expressed in the tones of

its loudest speakers, we are apt to look on all the reformers as actuated by a violent animosity to all that was Roman, and on the adherents of Rome as unrelentingly bent to destroy and exterminate all that was Protestant.

Whilst this state of things was pending, and whilst the spirit of inquiry was at least as much alive in England as on the continent, Henry VIII. was drawn into a difference with the Papal see on the subject of his divorce with Catharine of Arragon. The merits of the question may be debated elsewhere. This much alone we may observe, that Henry, if he acted from principle, not from passion, might have suffered his scruples to weigh with him, when his wife was young and well-favoured, not when she had grown old and care-worn; when she brought him a rich dowry, not when he had absorbed and spent it; when he had hopes of a male heir to his throne, not when those hopes had been disappointed, the lady Mary being the sole issue of his alliance. But, whatever the moving cause, he was in hostility to the see of Rome; and his only chance of making head against it, was to call up and give strength to the spirit of reformation.

Cranmer had been introduced to him by some casual observations on the best way of settling the question of the divorce; and Cranmer from that time forth Henry steadily favoured and protected. In 1533, the king threw off the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, and declared the independence of his kingdom and of its Church. But it has been said that he rejected the Pope, not the Papacy. The Church was to be independent of Rome; but not independent absolutely. For a spiritual

he substituted a temporal head: and wished to confer on that temporal head—himself—all the ecclesiastical authority which had been enjoyed by the spiritual. Cranmer was now Archbishop of Canterbury. His character has been differently described by those, who have taken their views of it from different sides of the question. His greatest enemies can scarcely deny him the virtues of mildness, moderation and patience, nor the praise of learning and candour¹. His greatest admirers can hardly affirm that he was free from weakness and timidity, and a too ready compliance with the whims and wishes of those in power. But he had a hard post to fill. Henry had thrown off the power of the Pope, and so had thrown himself into the party of the reformers; but he had no mind to throw off all the errors of Popery, nor to go all lengths with the Reformation. Cranmer had often to steer his course warily, lest his bark should make shipwreck altogether; and over zeal for his cause might provoke the hostility of one, whose word was law,

¹ His first Protestant successor in the archiepiscopal see has thus described him:—*Ut theologiam a barbarie vindicaret, adjecit literas Græcas et Hebræas; quarum sane post susceptum doctoratus gradum constat eum perstudiosum fuisse. Quibus perceptis antiquissimos tam Græcos quam Latinos patres evoluit: concilia omnia et antiquitatem ad ipsa Apostolorum tempora investigavit; theologiam totam, detracta illa quam sophistæ obduxerunt vitiata cute, ad vivum resecavit: quam tamen non doctrina magis quam moribus et vita expressit. Mira enim temperantia, mira animi lenitate atque placabilitate fuit; ut nulla injuria aut contumelia ad iram aut vindictam provocare possit; inimicissimosque, quorum vim ac potentiam etsi despexit ac leviter tulit, ab offensione tamen ad inimicitias deponendas atque gratiam ineundam sæpe humanitate duxit. Eam præterea constantiam, gravitatem ac moderationem præ se tulit, ut in omni varietate rebusque, sive secundis, sive adversis, nunquam turbari animum ex fronte vultuque colligeres.*—Matt. Parker, *De Antiq. Britann. Eccles.* p. 495. Lond. 1729.

and whose will would brook no restraint from an archbishop, when it had dethroned a Pope.

During Henry's reign several documents were put forth, varying in their complexion according as Cranmer had more or less influence with him. The Six Articles nearly swamped the Reformation, and endangered even the archbishop. The *Bishop's Book*, or *the Institution of a Christian Man*, was a confession of faith set forth when Cranmer and Ridley were in the ascendant. But it was succeeded by the *King's Book*, the *Necessary Doctrine*, which was the king's modification of the *Bishop's Book*, in which Gardiner had greater influence, and which restored some of those doctrines of the Roman communion, which the *Bishop's Book* had discarded¹.

Cranmer was himself not as yet fully settled in his views. He had early split with the Papacy, and convinced himself of the need of reformation, and of the general defection from the faith of the Scriptures and the primitive Church. But he was some time before he gave up the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and other opinions in which he had been bred up². The bishops and clergy in general were far less disposed to reformation than the king or the archbishop. It was rather by an exercise of regal prerogative than by the force of persuasion, that changes were effected, even to the extent which took place in Henry's reign. It was also

¹ See Cardwell's *Synodalia*, p. 34, Note.

² Ridley was converted from a belief in Transubstantiation to belief in the Spiritual Presence by reading Ratramn's Book, and he was the means of bringing over Cranmer, who in time brought Latimer to the same conviction. See Ridley's *Life of Ridley*, p. 192. The date assigned to Ridley's conviction is 1545. See also Soames' *Hist. of Reformation*. Vol. III. ch. II. p. 17.

not much to the taste of the clergy, that they should be forced to pay the same obedience to a temporal, which they had hitherto paid to a spiritual head: especially when Henry seemed to claim, and Cranmer, at least for a time, to sanction spiritual obedience to such a temporal authority; and most of all, when Henry had given marked indications that, instead of making lighter the yoke which the Pope had put upon them, his little finger would be thicker than the Pope's loins. But neither clergy nor people were allowed to speak louder than the king chose to suffer. Convocation, both in this reign and in the next, had little weight, and was not often consulted.

However, in Henry's reign many important steps were taken. The Church was declared independent of Rome. The Bible was translated into English. So also were many portions of the Church service. Negotiations were opened with the German Reformers, especially with Melancthon, whom Henry and Cranmer besought in vain to come over and help them¹. And in 1538, in consequence of conferences between Cranmer and the German divines, a body of thirteen Articles was drawn up, in great measure agreeing with the Confession of Augsburg².

On the accession of Edward VI., who was himself a zealous partizan of the Reformation, greater changes were speedily made. In 1547 the first book of Homilies

¹ Melancthon seems to have known Henry's character too well to wish to become his counsellor. See Lawrence, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 186, and Dr. Cardwell's *Preface to the two Liturgies of King Edward VI.* Oxf. 1838, p. iv., Note 6.

² See Cranmer's *Works* by Jenkyns, Vol. iv. p. 273.

was put forth. In 1548 'The archbishop of Canterbury with other learned and discreet bishops and divines' were appointed 'by the king to draw an order of divine worship, having respect to the pure religion of Christ taught in the Scripture, and to the practice of the primitive Church.' This commission is said to have consisted of Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury; Day, bishop of Chichester; Goodrich, bishop of Ely; Skip, bishop of Hereford; Holbeach, of Lincoln; Ridley, of Rochester; Thirlby, of Westminster; May, dean of St. Paul's; Taylor, dean of Lincoln; Haines, dean of Exeter; Robertson, archdeacon of Leicester; Redmayne, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge; Cox, almoner to the king, and dean of Westminster and Christ Church¹. These commissioners, or a portion of them², drew up the first Service Book of Edward VI., which was approved by Convocation, and confirmed by both houses of parliament. The principal sources, from which it was derived, were the ancient offices of the Church of England, and with them very probably the Liturgy drawn up by Melancthon and Bucer at the request of Herman, arch-

¹ See Strype's *Cranmer*, p. 193. Ridley's *Life of Ridley*, p. 221. Collyer's *Eccl. Hist.* Vol. II. p. 252, &c. Downe's *Lives of the Compilers of the Liturgy*, prefixed to Sparrow's *Rationale*. Soames' *Hist. Ref.* Vol. III. p. 253. The first Service Book was attributed by his contemporary Bale to Cranmer. On Cranmer's approbation of it, see Jenkyns' *Cranmer*, Vol. I. pp. LIII., LIV.

² Soames seems satisfied that the parties actually engaged were Cranmer, Ridley, Goodrich, Holbeach, May, Taylor, Haynes, and Cox. 'If,' he says, 'it be true that Dr. Redmayn did not cordially approve the new Liturgy, that circumstance is to be regretted, for the age could boast of few men more erudite and honest.' Vol. III. p. 256. This witness is true.

bishop of Cologne, for the use of his diocese, which had been principally derived from the ancient liturgy of Nuremberg¹.

The same year Cranmer translated a Catechism written by Justus Jonas, which he put forth with his own authority, and which is commonly called Cranmer's Catechism. The Calvinistic reformers of the continent made many objections to the Liturgy as drawn up in 1548: and many English divines entertained similar scruples. It is probable, that the clergy at large were not desirous of farther reformation. But the king and the archbishop were both anxious for a revision, which should do away with any appearance of giving sanction to Roman superstitions. Accordingly an order was given to prepare a new Service Book. The king and his council were most zealous in favour of the change, and it is even said that the king declared, in a spirit like his father's, that if the bishops would not make the desired change, he would interpose his own supreme authority to enforce its acceptance.

The new Service Book was put forth in 1552, and, with few exceptions, although these few are very important, it was the same as that we now possess under the name of the Book of Common Prayer.

The convocation was not permitted to pass its judgment on it, because it would, in all probability, have thrown all possible difficulties in the way of its publication. It came forth with the authority of parliament,

¹ See Cardwell's *Preface to the two Liturgies of Edw. VI.*, p. xiii., and the authorities there referred to.

though the act, which enjoined its acceptance, declared that the objections to the former book were rather curious than reasonable¹.

The same year saw the publication of the forty-two 'Articles of Religion.' They were framed by the archbishop at the king's command, and committed to certain bishops to be inspected and approved by them. They were then returned to the archbishop and amended by him; he then sent them to Sir William Cecil, and Sir John Cheke, who agreed that the archbishop should offer them to the king; which accordingly he did. They were then communicated to some other divines, and returned once more to the archbishop. The archbishop made his last remarks upon them, and so returned them again in three days to the council, beseeching them to prevail with the king to give authority to the bishops to cause their respective clergy to subscribe them².

¹ Strype's *Cranmer*, pp. 210, 266, 289. Ridley's *Life of Ridley*, p. 333. Collyer's *Eccl. Hist.* II. 309. Soames, III. ch. vi. p. 592. 'The prelates themselves appear to have considered the existing Liturgy as sufficiently unexceptionable, for in the Act authorizing the new one, it was declared, that the former book contained nothing but what was agreeable to the word of God, and the primitive Church; and that such doubts as had been raised in the use and exercise thereof, proceeded rather from the curiosity of the ministers and mistakes, than of any other worthy cause.' Soames, III. p. 595.

² Wake's *State of the Church, &c.*, p. 599: quoted by Cardwell, *Synodalia*, Vol. I. p. 3. See also Jenkyns' *Cranmer*, Vol. I. p. 357. It is asserted by Strype, in his *Life of Cranmer*, and repeated by Gloucester Ridley, that of these Articles 'the archbishop was the penner, or at least the great director, with the assistance, as is very probable, of bishop Ridley.' *Ridley's Life*, p. 343.

Mr. Soames says, 'Of the Articles now framed abp. Cranmer must be considered as the sole compiler. . . . It seems likely that he consulted his friend Ridley, and that he obtained from him many notes. It is however certain that the bishop of London was not actually concerned in preparing the Articles, as Cranmer, when examined at Oxford, took upon

It has been doubted whether these Articles, thus drawn up, were ever sanctioned by convocation. Dr. Cardwell, in his *Synodalia*, has given good reason to think that they received full synodical authority.

It has been shewn by archbishop Laurence¹ and others, that the Lutheran Confessions of Faith, especially the Confession of Augsburg, were the chief sources to which Cranmer was indebted for the Articles of 1552. He did not servilely follow, but yet made copious use of them.

The chief assistant to Cranmer, both in this labour and in the translations and revisions of the Liturgy, was unquestionably his great friend and counsellor, Ridley. It is well known that he had material influence in inducing the archbishop to renounce the doctrine of Transubstantiation and to embrace that of the Spiritual Presence²: and the Romanist party of the day asserted that Cranmer derived all his learning from Ridley. However untrue this may be, it is pretty certain that they always acted in concert. In the drawing up of the first Service Book, Ridley was one of the commissioners; and, no doubt, next to Cranmer, had a principal hand in compiling and afterwards revising it. Some of the commissioners protested against the passing of the Act for authorizing the first book, inasmuch as it went beyond their views of liturgical reform. But Ridley shewed the greatest zeal to induce conformity both to it, and to the Second Service Book, which was far more extensively

himself the whole responsibility of that work,' for which he quotes Foxe, 1704. Soames' *Hist. Ref.* iii. p. 648.

¹ *Bampton Lectures*, *passim*; especially p. 229.

² Ridley's *Life of Ridley*, p. 162, referred to above.

reformed. And indeed throughout, Cranmer and he appear to have walked in the same course, and acted on the same principles.

It is of consequence to remember these facts. For if Cranmer and Ridley were the chief compilers both of the Prayer Book and of the Articles : although the Church is in no degree bound by their private opinions ; yet, when there is a difficulty in understanding a clause either in the Articles or the Liturgy, which are the two standards of authority as regards the doctrine of the English Church, it cannot but be desirable to elucidate such difficulties by appealing to the writings, and otherwise expressed opinions, of these two reformers. It is true, both Liturgy and Articles have been altered since their time. Yet by far the larger portion of both remains just as they left them. The convocation appears to have made little alteration in the Articles, and none in the Liturgy in Edward's reign : for the Second Service Book was not submitted to it, and it has been even doubted whether the Articles were passed by it.

The event, which seemed to crush the Reformation in the bud, in fact gave it life. Neither clergy nor people appear to have been very hearty in its cause, when it came commended to them by the tyranny of Henry, or even by the somewhat arbitrary authority of Edward and the Protector Somerset. But when its martyrs bled at the stake, and when the royal prerogative was arrayed against it ; it then became doubly endeared to the people, as the cause of liberty as well as of religion.

Elizabeth, though not less a Tudor than her predecessors, was wiser, if not better than they. She at once disclaimed the title of Supreme Head of the Church,

in such a sense as might make it appear that her authority was spiritual, or trenching on the prerogative and rights of the clergy¹. She allowed the convocation to be consulted, both on the Liturgy and the Articles.

And now both clergy and laity were more prepared to adopt the tenets and the worship of the Reformers. Men, who did not wish to change their creed at the will of Henry, had now learned to dread the despotism of Rome, as exhibited in the reign of Mary. There were still many different sets of opinion in the country. A large number of clergy and laity were still for communion with Rome and for retaining the Mass: others had imbibed a love of the doctrine and discipline of Geneva, and viewed a surplice with horror and aversion: others again leant to what were called Lutheran sentiments, and were viewed, by one extreme as papists, by the other as heretics. Happily, the leading divines in the Church, and especially Parker, the new archbishop, were imbued with moderate sentiments, and succeeded for a time in steering the Ark of their Church skilfully amid the fury of the contending elements. Their wise measures and the gradual progress of opinions in the course of time appeased the vehemence of the Romanist party; though it is painful to add that measures of a most cruel character were too often adopted by the friends of the Reformation, against the leading propagators of Romish doctrine; measures which stain the memory of Elizabeth's reign, almost as deeply, and not so excusably, as the fires of Smith-

¹ In her *Injunctions* set forth in the year 1539, referred to and confirmed in the XXIVth Article of the Church.

field do that of Mary's¹. But though Romanism was then decaying, the opposite extreme party was gradually advancing; and it advanced, till in the end it overthrew the altar and the throne. Its influence, however, was not great on the formularies of the Church. The Second Service Book of Edward VI. was restored in the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth, with some alterations, principally by the insertion of a few rubrics and passages from the First Service Book, and partly by the omission of one or two sentences which were thought needlessly offensive, or doubtful in their orthodoxy. The Prayer Book underwent subsequent revisions in the reign of James I.² and Charles II., which reduced it to its present form.

The alterations in the Articles have been fewer, and perhaps less important. Soon after his appointment to the primacy, which took place in 1559, archbishop Parker set on foot various measures for the regulation and government of the Church, now again under the care of a reforming sovereign, and with a reforming archbishop at its head. It appears that one of Parker's earliest labours was directed towards a recasting of the 'Articles of Religion.' He expunged some parts of the original Articles, and added some others. In this work he was guided, like Cranmer, in a great degree by Lutheran formularies. As Cranmer had derived much from the Confession of Augsburg, so he took several clauses from the Confession of Wurtemberg³. Both houses of convocation considered the draught of the

¹ See Soames' *Elizabethan Religious History*, ch. v.

² Laurence's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 233.

Articles thus made by the archbishop, and by him committed to their inspection and revision. The convocation, as appears from an original document in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, made several farther alterations besides those which the archbishop had made. Especially they erased the latter part of the original 3rd Article, concerning the preaching to the spirits in prison, the whole of the 39th, 40th and 42nd, the archbishop having previously erased the 41st, thus reducing the whole number to 38. There was some little difference between the copy of the Articles thus submitted to, and approved by the convocation in 1662, and the copy afterwards published by the Queen's command, and with her royal approbation. The latter omitted the 29th Article, whose title was 'Impii non manducant Corpus Christi in usu cœnæ,' and added the famous clause in the 20th Article, 'Habet Ecclesia ritus statuendi jus et in fidei controversiis Auctoritatem.' Both alterations are believed to be due to the Queen herself, in the exercise of what she considered her undoubted right.

An English translation of these Articles was put forth soon after by the authority of convocation, not apparently of the queen. This translation does not contain the famous clause on Church authority, which the queen or her council had inserted, nor yet the Article 'Impii non manducant,' which the convocation had authorized, but which the council had expunged¹.

In the year 1571 the Articles were again subscribed by both houses of convocation, and committed to the

¹ See Cardwell's *Synodalia*, p. 34.

editorship of Bishop Jewell. They were then put forth in their present form both in Latin and English; and received not only the sanction of convocation, but also of parliament. The Latin Articles, as put forth at this period, omitted the famous clause concerning Church authority; the English retained it. Both contained the 29th Article, concerning the wicked not eating the Body of Christ.

The Articles, which were now 39 in number, making with the Confirmation 40, were thus set forth with the authority of the queen, of the convocation, and of the parliament. The clause concerning Church authority was still, however, in a measure doubtful; it being even to this day uncertain whether it received fully the sanction of convocation. The bishops of both provinces soon after enacted canons, by which all members were bound to subscribe the Articles approved in the synod¹.

The mode in which the Articles, thus reduced to their present form, were drawn up and imposed upon the Church, is a subject which may well admit of question and debate. The exercise of State authority, in the whole course of the Reformation, corresponds more with the notions of prerogative suited to those days, than with the feelings of modern times². But, whatever may

¹ Cardwell's *Synodalia*, Vol. i. p. 127.

² It will be remembered that in the reign of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. the whole nation, and therefore of course the king and the parliament, considered themselves as members of the national Church. Hence their interference in the reformation in the Church was a very different thing from the interference of a parliament, not consisting exclusively of churchmen. The question, as to how far the laity ought to be consulted in drawing up formularies or services, may be considered as open to discussion.

be said on this head, one fact is plain, viz. that the Articles thus drawn up, subscribed, and authorized, have ever since been signed and assented to by all the clergy of the Church, and by every graduate of both Universities; and have hence an authority far beyond that of any single convocation or parliament, viz. the unanimous and solemn assent of all the bishops and clergy of the Church, and of the two Universities, for well-nigh three hundred years.

In the interpretation of them, our best guides must be, first, their own natural, literal, grammatical meaning; next to this, a knowledge of the controversies which had prevailed in the Church, and made such Articles necessary; then, the other authorized formularies of the Church; after them, the writings and known opinions of such men as Cranmer, Ridley, and Parker, who drew them up; then, the doctrines of the primitive Church, which they professed to follow; and lastly, the general sentiments of the distinguished English divines who have been content to subscribe the Articles, and have professed their agreement with them for now 300 years. These are our best guides for their interpretation. Their authority is derivable from Scripture alone.

On the subject of subscription, of late so painfully agitated, very few words may be sufficient. To sign any document in a non-natural sense seems hardly consistent with Christian integrity or common manliness. But on the other hand, a national Church should never be needlessly exclusive. It should, we can hardly doubt, be ready to embrace, if possible, all who truly believe in God and in Jesus Christ whom He hath sent. Accordingly our own Church requires of its *lay* members no

confession of their faith, except that contained in the Apostles' Creed¹.

In the following pages an attempt is made to interpret and explain the Articles of the Church, which bind the consciences of her clergy, according to their natural and genuine meaning; and to prove that meaning to be both Scriptural and Catholic. None can feel so satisfied, nor act so straightforwardly, as those who subscribe them in such a sense. But, if we consider how much variety of sentiment may prevail amongst persons, who are in the main sound in the faith, we can never wish that a national Church, which ought to have all the marks of catholicity, should enforce too rigid and uniform an interpretation of its formularies and terms of union. The Church should be not only Holy and Apostolic, but as well, One and Catholic. Unity and universality are scarcely attainable, where a greater rigour of subscription is required, than such as shall ensure an adherence and conformity to those great catholic truths, which the primitive Christians lived by, and died for.

¹ See the Baptismal Service, and the Visitation of the Sick.

ARTICLE I.

Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.

THERE is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the Maker and Preserver of all things, both visible and invisible. And in the unity of this Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

De Fide in Sacrosanctam Trinitatem.

UNUS est vivus et verus Deus, æternus, incorporeus, impartibilis, impassibilis; immensæ potentie, sapientie, ac bonitatis; Creator et Conservator omnium, tum visibilium, tum invisibilium. Et in unitate hujus divinæ naturæ, tres sunt Personæ, ejusdem essentie, potentie, ac æternitatis; Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus.

SECTION I.

HISTORY.

THIS Article is evidently concerned with two somewhat distinct subjects.

FIRST. The Nature and Essential Attributes of God in the general.

SECONDLY. The Doctrine of the Trinity in Unity.

The **FIRST** part is common to natural and revealed religion, and requires less either of illustration from history or demonstration from Scripture; it having been the universal Creed, both of Jews and Christians, that ‘God is one, living and true, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, the Maker and Preserver of all things, both visible and invisible.’

There have, however, been two classes of speculators against whom we may suppose these words to be directed.

1 The obscure sect of the *Anthropomorphites* is reckoned as a heresy of the fourth century, and is said to have reappeared

in the tenth, in the district of Vicenza in Italy¹. Their opinion, as expressed by their name, was that God was in form as a man, material, and with body and members like our own.

2 The more important and dangerous error of the *Pantheists* may not be directly alluded to in the Article, but is plainly opposed by it.

Pantheism has been the prevailing Esoteric doctrine of all Paganism, and, with various modifications, the source of a great part of ancient philosophy². The Orphic Hymns have evident traces of it. Thales and the Eleatic School expressed it distinctly, and in the definite language of philosophy³. There can be little doubt that it was the great doctrine revealed in the mysteries. The Egyptian Theology was plainly based upon it⁴. It was at the root of the Polytheism of the Greeks and Romans, and their gross idolatry was probably but an outward expression of its more mystic refinements⁵. The Brahmins and Buddhists, whose religious systems still prevail amongst nearly half the human race, though also, exoterically, gross Polytheists, are yet, in their philosophy, undisguised Pantheists⁶. The Jewish Cabala is thought to have drunk deep of the same fountain⁷.

¹ See Suicer, s. v. ἀνθρωπομορφῆται, and Mosheim, *Ecclesiast. Hist.* Cent. x. Pt. II. ch. v. § 4.

² Cudworth, *Int. Syst.* ch. iv. *passim*, especially §§ 29, 32, 33, 34.

³ Cudworth, B. I. ch. iv. §§ 30, 31, Tennemann's *Manual of Philosophy*, pp. 59, 70. (Oxf. 1832.)

⁴ Εγὼ εἰμι πᾶν τὸ γεγονὸς, καὶ ὄν, καὶ ἐσόμενον, καὶ τὸν ἔμῳ πέπλῳ οὐδεὶς πῶ θνητὸς ἀπεκάλυψεν: 'I am all that hath been, is, and shall be, and my veil hath no mortal ever uncovered.'—Inscription on the Temple of Sais, ap. Plutarch, *de Iside*. Again, τὸν πρῶτον Θεὸν τῷ πάντι τὸν αὐτὸν νομίζουσι. Plutarch, from Hecatæus, *de Isid. et Osiri*. See Cudworth, ch. iv. Vol. II. pp. 170, 175. All that Cudworth adduces, and it is well worth reading, shews that the Egyptians were genuine Pantheists.

⁵ See Faber, *Pagan Idolatry*, B. I. ch. iii.

⁶ See Sir W. Jones's *Works*, Vol. I. p. 252; Maurice's *History of Hindostan and Indian Antiquities*, *passim*. Faber, as above; Mill's *Pantheistic Theory*.

⁷ Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, note 16.

When the Christian faith came in contact with Eastern philosophy, it is probable that Pantheistic notions found their way into its corruptions. Gnostics and Manichees, and possibly some of the later heretics, such as the Paulicians, had some admixture of Pantheism in their Creeds. Simon Magus himself may possibly have used its language, when he gave himself out as 'the great power of God.'

Its leading idea is, that God is every thing, and every thing is God¹. All personal character of the Deity is lost. The supreme being of the Hindoos is therefore neither male nor female, but neuter². All the numberless forms of matter are but different appearances of God; and though he is invisible, yet every thing you see is God³. Accordingly the Deity himself becomes identified with the worshipper. 'He, who knows that Deity, is the Deity itself⁴.' Hence, as all living beings are manifestations of, and emanations from, the Deity; the devout Brahmin or Buddhist, while he believes that by piety man may become more and more truly God, looks forward, as his final consummation and bliss, to *Nirwana*, or absorption in the Deity.

This system of religion or philosophy, which has prevailed so extensively in heathendom, and found favour with the early philosophic heretics, and probably with the brethren of the free spirit in the twelfth century⁵, was taught in the seventeenth century by Benedict de Spinoza, a Portuguese Jew⁶, and has been called from him Spinozism. Some of the philosophic

¹ Jupiter est quodcumque vides, quocumque moveris, *Lucan.* ix. 580. See also Virg. *Eclog.* iii. 60, *Æn.* vi. 724, *Lucret.* ii. 61.

² Sir W. Jones's *Works*, Vol. i. p. 249.

³ Sir W. Jones's *Works*, Vol. i. p. 252; Ward's *Religion of the Hindoos*, Vol. iv. p. 274.

⁴ Mill's *Pantheistic Theory*, p. 159.

⁵ Mosheim, Cent. xii. Pt. ii. ch. v. § 10.

⁶ Mosheim, Cent. xvii. § 1, 24, Tennemann, p. 324. Giordano Bruno, in the sixteenth century, a Dominican, was burnt at Rome as a heretic, A.D. 1600, for holding opinions very similar to Pantheism. See Tennemann, p. 283.

divines of Germany have revived it of late, and have taught it as the solution of all the Christian mysteries; so that with them the Christ or God-man is not the individual personal Jesus: but *mankind* is God made man, the miracle-worker, the sinless one; who dies and rises, and ascends into heaven, and through faith in whom man is justified.

The history of the SECOND part of this Article, that is, of the doctrine of the Trinity, may be considered as almost equivalent to the history of Christianity.

I. What degree of knowledge of it there may have been previously to the coming of Christ, is a question of great interest, but of great difficulty. This question as regards Scripture must be deferred to the next section; here it is considered by the light of history alone.

It has been thought, with considerable reason, that there are distinct intimations of it (1) in the Jewish writings, (2) in the mythology of most ancient nations, (3) in the works of Plato and other philosophers.

1 The Jewish Targums, and Philo-Judæus both speak frequently of the *Word of the Lord*. The latter may possibly have been indebted to philosophic sources. This can hardly be conjectured with probability of the former; and although they are none of them much earlier than the Christian Era, there is no doubt they speak the language and contain the tradition of former ages. Passages, such as that in the Targum, in Psalm cx., where 'the Lord said unto my Lord' is rendered 'the Lord said unto His Word,' and many like it, seem, at first sight at least, very clearly to indicate a notion of Personal plurality in the Divine Unity¹. Yet, of late, a different opinion has prevailed concerning the signification of the term

¹ See Allix's *Testimony of the Ancient Jewish Church against the Unitarians*, Bryant's *Opinions of Philo-Judæus*, Bull, *Fid. Nic. Def.* 1. 1. 16—19.

Memra or *Word* (מִמְרָא דֵּי) used in the Targums; it being contended that the phrase means not a distinct and separate Person, but is, in fact, only another form of the pronoun 'Himself'. Both views have found able advocates and may be supported by considerable arguments, and therefore the question concerning the Jewish opinions on the Trinity must be considered as one, which is not fully decided.

2 In the mythology of almost all nations, it is plain that the number three has been a sacred number. The triads of classical mythology (e. g. Zeus, Poseidon, and Hades; or again, Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva in the Capitol) are well known². More remarkable by far is the Trimourti of Hindostan, in which Brahma, the Creator, Vishnu, the Preserver, and Siva, the Destroyer and Regenerator, are the three expressions or manifestations of the great Universal Deity, and are represented as one, and yet distinct³. It is true, the mythological signification of this triad is vastly different from the meaning of the Christian Trinity; but when we consider especially, that, as the first person is the Creator, and the third the Regenerator, so the second is the person, who is incarnate for the preservation of mankind, and that in one of his incarnations a most remarkable prophecy of Christ in Scripture is evidently applied to him⁴; it seems hard to doubt that some ancient patriarchal tradition

¹ Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, Lect. vii. p. 221, and note 93.

² Cudworth, B. i. ch. iv. § 27, p. 319, § 32, p. 470. The Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva of the Capitol were, of course, the same as the three great gods, Tinia, Cupra, and Menrva, who had temples in every Etruscan city.

³ See the engraving which faces the title-page of the first volume of Maurice's *Indian Antiquities*, also Ward's *Religion of the Hindoos*, Vol. ii. p. 177, Sir W. Jones's *Works*, Vol. i. pp. 249, 250.

⁴ Vishnu is represented with a serpent curled round him, which at one time bites his heel, and he appears to be suffering; at another time its head is crushed beneath his foot. See Maurice's *Hist. of Hindostan*, Vol. ii. frontispiece, &c.

suggested the idea of the Trimourti, however that tradition may have been disfigured and obscured¹.

3 Plato and other Greek Philosophers, are generally considered as having expounded a doctrine, which bears some resemblance to the doctrine of the Gospels². If it be so, we may, probably enough, trace his sentiments to some like source of patriarchal tradition or Jewish Creed. Some think Plato had it of Pherecydes of Syros, who may perhaps have learned it from an Eastern source. Others, that, according to the testimony of Numenius, Plato gained a knowledge of Hebrew doctrine during his thirteen years residence in Egypt³. But on the other hand, it has been argued that Plato's view of the Logos was utterly unlike the Christian belief in the Trinity. It is said, he never spoke of the Word or 'Reason of God as a distinctly existing person; it was only a mode or relation, in which the operations of the Deity might be contemplated⁴.' After the Christian Revelation indeed, philosophic Christians, and still more philosophic heretics, early used Platonic terms to express Christian doctrine. Hence the language of philosophy became tinged with the language of Christianity: hence too, at a very early period, the heretics, using the language of Platonism, corrupted Christianity with Platonic philosophy. Hence again, St. John, who wrote after the rise of such heretics, uses language, which they had introduced; yet not in their sense of such language, but with the very object of

¹ On the Trinity of Zoroaster and the Magi, see Cudworth, *Intell. Syst.* B. i. ch. iv. § 16, &c. On the appearance of a Trinity in the Egyptian Pantheism, see § 18. Vol. ii. p. 194.

² On Plato's *Trinity*, see Cudworth, B. i. ch. iv. § 24. Vol. ii. p. 300. § 34. Vol. iii. pp. 54, 82, &c.

³ On the statement of Numenius, who asks, 'What is Plato, but Moses in Greek?' see Lardner's *Test. of Anc. Heathens*, ch. xxxv. Allix's *Judgment of the Jewish Church*, ch. xxiii. p. 286.

⁴ See Burton, *Bampton Lect.*, p. 213.

correcting their errors¹. It is clear then that, in more ways than one, we may account for the fact, that St. John used terms, which had been used before the Christian Revelation; and the sneer of the infidel, which hints that he learned his doctrine from Plato, becomes harmless and unmeaning².

II. When once the mystery of the Trinity had been revealed in the Gospel, it became the fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith. Yet we must not expect to find the first Christian writers using the same technical language to express their belief in it, which afterwards became necessary, when heresy sprang up and controversy gave rise to definite controversial terms. Unitarian writers have charged Justin Martyr (A. D. 150) with being the first to introduce "the Platonic doctrine of a second God" into Christianity; that is to say, they have admitted that Justin Martyr speaks of Christ as God, but deny that the Apostolic fathers held the doctrines of Trinitarianism. Such assertions, however unfounded, render the doctrines of the Apostolical fathers not a little important; as it could hardly fail to puzzle us, if we found the earliest Christians and their most famous pastors ignorant of what we have learned to esteem the ground-work of the faith.

There is certainly nothing in the subjects treated of by any of the Apostolical fathers, to lead them naturally to set forth a distinct acknowledgment of the doctrine of the Trinity, or of the Divinity of Jesus Christ; and many expressions might occur of love to Christ and reverence for Him, without a distinct enunciation of the doctrine of His Godhead. It is therefore the more remarkable and satisfactory, when we find, as we do, in all the works ascribed to those fathers commonly called Apostolical, passages, which seem distinctly to assert the Deity of Jesus Christ, and so, at least by implication, the doctrine of

¹ Burton, *Bampton Lect.*, Lect. VII. and note 90.

² Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, ch. xv.

the Trinity. Ignatius, especially, is so clear on this point, that the only possible way of evading the force of his testimony is to deny the genuineness of his epistles. A majority of learned men are of opinion that this question has been well nigh set at rest by Bp. Pearson in his *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ*¹.

¹ The following passages exhibit some of the testimonies of the Apostolic fathers to the Divinity of Christ, and by implication, to the doctrine of the Trinity.

Clemens Romanus. 'The Sceptre of the Majesty of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, came not in the shew of pride and arrogance, though He might have done so.' (1 Cor. xvi.) 'Being content with the portion God had dispensed to you; and hearkening diligently to His word, ye were enlarged in your bowels, having HIS SUFFERINGS always before your eyes.' (1 Cor. ii. See also chapters xxxii. xxxvi. xlv. &c.)

Ignatius calls our Saviour 'Jesus Christ our God,' (in the Inscription to the Epistles to the Ephesians and Romans, also in *Trall.* 7. *Rom.* iii.) speaks of 'the Blood of God,' (*Eph.* i.) 'the passion of my God,' (*Rom.* vi.) says, 'I glorify God, even Jesus Christ. (*Smyrn.* i.) 'When God was manifested in human form (*ἀνθρωπίνως*) for newness of eternal life.' (*Eph.* xix.) 'There is one Physician, both fleshly and spiritual, made and not made, God incarnate; true life in death; both of Mary and of God; first passible, then impassible; even Jesus Christ our Lord.' (*Eph.* vii.) 'Expect Him, who is above all time, eternal, invisible, though for our sakes made visible, who was intangible, impassible, yet for our sakes became subject to suffering, enduring all manner of ways for us.' (*Ign. to Polyc.* iii.) 'God, who was manifested by his Son Jesus Christ, who is the Eternal Word, not coming forth from silence.' (*Magn.* viii.)

The Trinity of Persons in the Godhead is plainly referred to in such passages as these:

'Study that so . . . ye may prosper in body and spirit, in faith and charity—in the Son, and in the Father, and in the Spirit—in the beginning and in the end;' and again, 'Be subject to your bishop and to one another, as Jesus Christ to the Father, according to the flesh, and as the Apostles both to Christ and the Father and the Holy Ghost.' (*Magn.* xiii.)

Polycarp speaks most clearly in the doxology ascribed to him, as some of his last words, in the *Circular Epistle of the Church of Smyrna on the Martyrdom of Polycarp*.

'For this, and for all things else, I praise Thee, I bless Thee, I glorify Thee, by the eternal and heavenly High Priest, Jesus Christ, Thy beloved Son, with whom, to Thee and the Holy Ghost, be glory both now and to all succeeding ages, Amen.' *Martyrdom of Polyc.* xiv. On this passage see *Waterland*, Vol. ii. p. 232.

Justin Martyr, A.D. 150, is the first early Christian writer, of whom we have any considerable remains. If he does not state the doctrine of the Trinity in the form of the Nicene or Athanasian Creeds, he yet clearly and constantly asserts that the Son is God, of one substance and nature with the Father, and yet numerically distinct from Him¹. The word *Trinity* occurs in a treatise attributed to Justin Martyr (*De Expositione*

A vindication of Clement of Rome and Polycarp from the imputation of Arianism may be found in Bull, *F. D.* II. 3. 2.

Barnabas, whose Epistle, though perhaps not the work of the Apostle of that name, is doubtless the work of one who lived nearly contemporaneously with the other Apostolical fathers, writes: 'For this cause the Lord was content to suffer for our souls, although He be the Lord of the whole earth; to whom God said before the beginning of the world, "Let us make man in our Image".' (*Barnab.* c. v.) Again, 'You have in this also the glory of Jesus, that by Him and for Him are all things.' *ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ πάντα καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν.* (c. XII. See Bull, *F. D.* I. 2. 2.)

Hermas, who is reckoned an Apostolical father, and was certainly a writer not later than the middle of the second century, has the following: 'The Son is indeed more ancient than any creature, inasmuch as He was in counsel with the Father at the creation of all things.' (*Simil.* IX. 12.) 'The Name of the Son of God is great, and without bounds, and the whole world is supported by it.' (*Simil.* IX. 14.)

Concerning the genuineness of the seven shorter Epistles of Ignatius, see Pearson's *Vindiciæ Ignat.* in the second Volume of *Cotelieri Patres Apostolici*. A Synopsis of his Arguments is given in Dupin's *Eccles. Hist.*; in the Life of Ignatius. See also Bp. Horsley's Works, Vol. IV. p. 133. Dr Burton (*Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers*, p. 14) enumerates the following, as great names to be ranked on the same side with Bp. Pearson in holding that the genuineness of these Epistles has been fully proved. I. Vossius, Ussher, Hammond, Petavius, Grotius, Bull, Cave, Wake, Cotelierius, Grabe, Du Pin, Tillemont, Le Clerc, Lardner, Horsley, &c. On the opposite side he reckons Salmasius, Blondel, Dallæus, Priestley.

¹ An example of his mode of speaking may be seen in the following short passage from Apol. I. c. 63: 'They, who say that the Son is the Father, are convicted of neither knowing the Father, nor of understanding that the God of the universe has a Son, who being the Firstborn Word of God, is also God.' Of Justin's sentiments on the Logos and the Trinity, see Bull, *F. D.* II. 4; Waterland, III. pp. 157, 246; Burton's *Testimonies of Ante-Nicene Fathers*, p. 30; Bp. Kaye's *Just. Mart.* ch. II, where also, in the Appendix, is an account of the opinions of Tatian, Athenagoras, and Theophilus of Antioch.

Fidei); but this work is generally allowed to be spurious. The first use of this term is therefore commonly ascribed to Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, A.D. 181, who speaks of the three days of creation, which preceded the creation of the sun and moon, as ‘types of the Trinity, viz. of God, His Word, and His Wisdom¹.’

Irenæus, A.D. 185, gives something like regular forms of creeds, greatly resembling the Apostles’ Creed (See i. 9, iv. 33). His statements of the Deity of Christ are singularly clear, and he expressly tells us that the Scriptures would never have given to any one absolutely the name of God, unless he were truly God². There is a well-known passage in a heathen author, somewhat earlier than Irenæus (the Philopatrîs of *Lucian*), which shews the received doctrine of the Church, at which he sneers, more plainly perhaps than if the words had been those of a Christian. There is a doubt whether the work is Lucian’s or not, but its genuineness is not of much consequence if, as is generally admitted, it was either his writing, or that of some contemporary of his³.

Tertullian, A.D. 200, both distinctly propounds the doctrine of the Trinity, and is the first *Latin*, who uses the term *Trinitas*⁴.

¹ Ad Autolychum, Lib. II. p. 106. τύποι Τριάδος, τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Λόγου αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς Σοφίας αὐτοῦ. On his doctrine, consult Bull, *F. D.* II. 4. 10.

² Iren. III. c. VI. § 1; Burton, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, p. 68: where see the testimony of Irenæus at length; also in Bull, *F. D.* II. 5, and Beaven’s *Account of Irenæus*, ch. IV.

³ The passage is Κρι. Καὶ τίνα ἐπωμόσωμαί γε. Τρι. Ὑψιμέδοντα Θεόν, μέγαν, ἄμβροτον, οὐρανίωνα, υἱὸν πατρὸς, πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, ἐν ἐκ τριῶν, καὶ ἐξ ἑνὸς τρία.

⁴ *e. g. adv. Præream*. c. III. Itaque duos et tres jam jactitant a nobis prædicari, se vero unius Dei cultores præsumunt, quasi non et unitas inrationabiliter collecta hæresin faciat, et Trinitas rationaliter expensa, veritatem constituat.

Dr Hey, in his lectures on the first Article, observes that the charges which the heretics made against the Catholics, of holding three Gods, is to

We might trace the chain onwards through Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Hippolytus, Cyprian, Dionysius, and so down to the Council of Nice. Some may see in the bold speculations of Origen, the germ of heresy even on the important doctrine of the Trinity; and Dionysius of Alexandria, in his zeal against Sabellius, appears to have been led into some heedless expressions. There is, however, little doubt that Origen was a firm believer in the Trinity; and the expressions of Dionysius, which called forth the censure of his brethren, were afterwards fully and satisfactorily explained. Thus all the early fathers who continued in the communion of the Catholic Church, are unanimous in their testimony to the faith of that Church in one God and three Persons in the Godhead.

Some even, who were charged with schism or heresy, as Montanus and Novatian, were yet clear and decided in their language on this head. Bingham¹ has collected abundant proof, that the devotions of the ancient Church were paid to every Person of the Blessed Trinity.

Bishop Bull, in his *Fidei Nicænæ Defensio*, and Dr Burton, in his *Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers*, have given fully the testimonies of the fathers to the Godhead of Christ before the Council of Nice. To their works the student may refer for farther evidence, that the doctrine of the Trinity was firmly

him the strongest evidence that the Catholics held the doctrine of the Trinity.

Tertullian distinctly illustrates the consubstantiality of the Persons in the Godhead, by introducing the comparison of the sun, and a ray from the sun, or light kindled from light. As the substance of the light remains the same, though a ray has been sent forth, or another light kindled, 'so what proceeds from God is both God, and the Son of God, and both are one.' *Apol.* c. xxi. See Bull, *F. D.* ii. 7; Burton, p. 162; and Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, p. 553, where the ambiguity of some of Tertullian's language is fully considered.

The use of the word *Trinity*, first to be found in Greek in Theophilus, and in Latin in Tertullian, received synodical authority in the Council of Alexandria, A.D. 317.

¹ *Eccl. Antiq.* Book xiii. ch. ii.

Jesus Christ. As was most probable, the Eastern rather than the Western Church, and especially, in the first instance, the Churches of Asia Minor, and afterwards the Church of Antioch, were the birth-places of the heresiarchs and of their heresies. These Churches exhibited, independently of distinct heresy, a considerable tendency to Judaism. The celebrated controversy about Easter first arose from the Churches of Proconsular Asia adopting the Jewish computation, in which they were followed by the Church of Antioch¹. Again, in the East it was, that the Judaical observance of the Sabbath, or seventh day of the week, prevailed; which is first condemned by St. Paul², then by Ignatius³, and afterwards by the council of Laodicea⁴.

The earliest heretics of whom we read are Simon Magus, and the Nicolaitans, both mentioned in Scripture; who adopted, according to Ecclesiastical history, the Gnostic philosophy, and endeavoured to combine it with the Gospel. Gnosticism, in its more developed form, seems to have taught that the one Supreme Intelligence, dwelling in darkness unapproachable, gave existence to a line of *Æons*, or heavenly spirits, who were all, more or less, partakers of His nature, (*i. e.* of a nature specifically the same) and included in His glory (*πλήρωμα*), though individually separate from the Sovereign Deity⁵. Of these *Æons* Christ or the *Logos* was the chief,—an emanation from God therefore, but not God Himself; although dwelling in the *Pleroma*, the special habitation, and probably the Bosom of God. Here then we see that the philosophic sects were likely to make our Lord but an emanation from God, not one with Him.

Cerinthus⁶, a heretic of the first century, is by some considered more as a Judaizer, by others more as a Gnostic or

¹ See Newman's *Arians*, ch. i. § 1.

² Col. ii. 16.

³ Ignat. *ad Magnes.* xviii.

⁴ Can. xxix. See Suicer, Vol. ii. p. 922.

⁵ Newman's *Arians*, ch. ii. § iv. p. 206.

⁶ See Mosheim, Cent. i. Pt. ii. ch. v. § 16.

philosophic heretic. It is probable, he combined both errors in one. But early in the second century, we meet with the Nazarenes and Ebionites, who undoubtedly owed their origin to Judaism, although, like others, they may have introduced some admixture of philosophy into their creed¹. All these held low opinions of the Person and nature of Christ. The Cerinthians are said to have held the common Gnostic doctrine, that Jesus was a mere man, with whom the Æon Christ was united at baptism. The Nazarenes are supposed to have held the birth of a Virgin, and to have admitted that Jesus was in a certain manner united to the Divine Nature. The Ebionites, on the other hand, are accused of esteeming Christ the son of Joseph and Mary, though with a heavenly mission and some portion of Divinity².

Here we have almost, if not quite, in Apostolic times, the germ at least of all false doctrine on the subject of the Trinity. Such heretics indeed, as have been mentioned, were at once looked on as enemies to, not professors of, the Gospel; and were esteemed, according to the strong language of St. John, not Christians but Antichrists.

In the latter part of the second century, the Church of Rome, which had been peculiarly free from heresy, was troubled by the errors of Theodotus and Artemon. They are generally looked on as mere humanitarians; but they probably held that Christ was a man endued with a certain Divine energy, or some portion of the Divine nature³.

¹ Mosheim, Cent. II. Pt. II. ch. v. §§ 2, 3. See also Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 247.

² Mosheim, Cent. II. Pt. II. ch. 5. § 21.

³ Theodotus having denied his faith in persecution excused himself by saying, that he had not denied God but man; he, according to Eusebius, being the first who asserted that Jesus Christ was a mere man; for all former heretics had admitted at least some Divinity in Jesus. (See Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 247). This should seem to shew that Theodotus was a mere humanitarian.

The end of the same century witnessed the rise of another heresy of no small consequence. Praxeas, of whose opinions we can form a more definite notion from Tertullian's treatise against him, asserted the doctrine, that there was but one Person in the Godhead. That one Person he considered to be both Father and Son; and was therefore charged with holding that the Father suffered, whence his followers were called Patripassians¹.

Noetus (A.D. 220) of Smyrna, and after him Sabellius of Pentapolis in Africa (A.D. 255), held a similar doctrine; which has since acquired the name of Sabellianism. Its characteristic peculiarity is a denial of the three Persons in the Trinity, and the belief that the Person of the Father, who is one with the Son, was incarnate in Christ. But a more heretical and dangerous form of the doctrine made, not the Godhead, but an emanation only from the Godhead, to have dwelt in Jesus; and thus what we may call the *low* Sabellians bordered on mere humanitarians, and also nearly symbolized on this important subject with Valentinus and other Gnostics, who looked on the supreme Æon, Christ or the Logos, as an emanation from God, who dwelt in Jesus and returned from Jesus to the Pleroma of God.

Beryllus, bishop of Bozrah, seems to have taken up this form of Sabellianism. He was converted by the arguments of Origen. But, not long after, Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch, the most important see in Asia, a man supported by the influence of the famous Zenobia, professed a creed, which some have considered pure humanitarianism; but which was evidently, more or less, what has been called the emanative, in contradistinction to the Patripassian, form of Sabellianism. He held 'that the Son and the Holy Ghost exist in God, in the same manner as the faculties of reason and activity do in man;

¹ See Tertullian, *adv. Praxeam*; also Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, p. 526; Mosheim, Cent. II. Pt. II. ch. v. § 20. Praxeas is placed A.D. 200. He propagated his opinions at Rome.

that Christ was a mere man ; but that the Reason or Wisdom of the Father descended into him, and by him wrought miracles upon earth, and instructed the nations ; and finally, that, on account of this union of the Divine Word with the man Jesus, Christ might, though improperly, be called God.' Several councils were called in consequence of this spiritual wickedness in high places ; and although the rhetoric and sophistry of Paulus for a time baffled his opponents, he was finally condemned by the Council of Antioch (A.D. 264), and dispossessed of his bishoprick by Aurelian (A.D. 272), after having held it, in spite of condemnation, by the aid of Zenobia¹.

The controversies, which these various errors gave rise to, naturally tended to unsettle men's minds, to introduce strife about words, and so paved the way for the most formidable heresy that has probably ever disturbed the Christian Church. Arius, a native of Antioch, but a presbyter of Alexandria, began by charging his bishop, Alexander, with Sabellianism. It is most probable that, as his predecessor Dionysius, in his zeal against Sabellianism, had been betrayed into incautious expressions, seeming to derogate from the dignity of Christ's Divine nature ; so Alexander, in his zeal to maintain that dignity, may have used language not unlike the language of the Patripassians. There is no doubt, however, that he was a sound believer in the Trinity. Arius was, from this beginning, led on to propound, and mould into shape, his own dangerous heresy.

It was unlike the heresy of any of his predecessors. For though some of them may have been mere humanitarians ; those, who held that the Logos dwelt in Christ, held that Logos to be either God, or an emanation from God, and so in some sense co-eternal and consubstantial. Arius, on the contrary, held that there was a time when the Son of God was not

¹ See Mosheim, Cent. III. Pt. II. ch. v. § 15 ; Newman's *Arians* ; Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, Note 103.

(ἦν πότε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν), and that He was created by God, of a substance which once was not (ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων). They called Him by the name of God, and allowed to Him, in terms, all the attributes of God; but denied that He was *homo-ousios*, of one Substance with the Father¹, or in any sense one with Him. The true Logos they esteemed to be merely the Wisdom, an attribute of God; but the Son they held to have been *created* before all worlds, and so far enlightened by the Wisdom of God, that He might, though improperly, be called the Logos, and that by Him God made the world. They said of Him, that before He was created or begotten, He did not exist (πρὶν γεννηθῆναι, οὐκ ἦν), and they explained the title of *μονογενὴς*, Only Begotten, as though it meant Begotten by God alone, *γεννηθεὶς παρὰ μόνου*².

Here we see a second and created God introduced into the Christian Theology. The Patripassians, on the one hand, had denied the Trinity of Persons; the Valentinians and Manichees, on the contrary, are accused of saying that there were three unconnected, independent Beings in the Godhead³. But Arianism taught distinctly the existence of one, or two, beings who were to be worshipped, as God, and yet were neither one with, nor of the same nature with the Father. The inevitable tendency of this was either to direct Polytheism, or more probably and naturally to Humanitarianism⁴.

The Council of Nice, consisting of 318 bishops, was summoned in 325 by Constantine the Great; which condemned Arianism, established the doctrine of the homo-ousion (i. e. that

¹ Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. i. p. 135. (fol. Lond. 1723.)

² This was the fallacy of Eunomius. See Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. ii. p. 138.

³ The Apostolical Canons mention and condemn certain persons who baptized in the name of three unoriginated principles, *τρεις ἀνάρχους*. *Can. Apost.* c. 49. And the first Council of Bracara says that the Gnostics and Priscillianists introduced a Trinity of Trinities. See Bingham, B. xl. ch. iii. § 4.

⁴ See Newman's *Arians*, ch. ii. § v.

the Son was consubstantial with the Father), and drew up the Creed which now bears the name of Nicene, with the exception of the clauses which follow the words 'I believe in the Holy Ghost.' Arianism, thus checked for a time, soon revived again. Constantine was convinced that Arius had been unjustly banished, and recalled him. His son Constantius, who ruled first in the East, and then over the whole empire, and afterwards Valens, who ruled also in the East, favoured the Arians. Partly by this powerful patronage, partly by subtilty of argument, and partly in consequence of the prevalence of Judaizing or philosophic doctrine, this dangerous heresy, or some modification of it, spread extensively, especially in the Eastern Churches. The famous Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, exhibited unbounded zeal and courage in defending the Catholic faith, and suffered greatly from the persecution of the Arians. There then arose a variety of sects, adopting more or less of the Arian tenets; such as the Eusebians, Anomœans, Semi-Arians. The latter adopted as their symbol the term *homoi-ousios*, of like substance, instead of *homo-ousios*, of one substance. From among the latter sprang *Macedonius*. The pure Arians, and those who symbolized with them—the Anomœans, and Eunomians, and Semi-Arians—appear to have held that the Holy Ghost, like the Son, was a created being. Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, whose followers were called Macedonians, or Pneumatomachi, seems to have been more orthodox on the Person of the Son; but to have esteemed, like the Arians, that the Holy Ghost was a creature¹. This heresy was condemned at the second General Council at Constantinople, A. D. 381;

¹ Macedoniani sunt a Macedonio Constantinopolitanæ ecclesiæ episcopo, quos et Πνευματομάχους Græci dicunt, eo quod de Spiritu Sancto litigant. Nam de Patre et Filio recte sentiunt, quod unius est ejusdemque substantiæ, vel essentiæ, sed de Spiritu Sancto hoc nolunt credere, creaturam Eum esse dicentes. S. August. *Hæres.* 52. See Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 316, Note, Art. VIII.

which added to the Nicene Creed the clauses which follow ‘I believe in the Holy Ghost¹.’ With this Council the struggles between the Catholics and the Arians ended. Arianism thenceforth became a heresy excommunicated, and detached from the Church². It found refuge for some time with the Gothic invaders of the Empire, who persecuted the Catholics; but at length declined and became extinct.

After this, we hear of a sect of Tritheists in the sixth century, the principal defender of whose doctrine was Philoponus of Alexandria³.

The discussions between the Nominalists and Realists of the middle ages often led to something like erroneous statements of the Trinitarian question; but these are scarcely deserving much consideration here.

After the Reformation, when freedom of opinion was introduced, and an unsettled state of mind naturally sprang from violent changes, several heretics arose, who denied the doctrine of the Trinity. Servetus, a Spaniard, in 1531, taught a doctrine like that of the low or emanative Sabellians; that Christ, who was born of the Virgin, was united to one of the two *personal representations* or *modes of existence*, which God, before the world, had produced within Himself. He was apprehended by Calvin, on his way through Geneva, and put to death⁴.

Several other sects of Arians and Anti-Trinitarians arose about this time; some of which took refuge in Poland, as the country of most religious liberty. They called themselves Unitarians. In the Cracow Catechism, which they published as their confession of faith, they plainly deny the Divinity of the

¹ With the exception of course of the famous ‘Filioque.’

² Much information on the terms of the controversy may be found by turning to the words *Τριάς, ὑπόστασις, οὐσία, ὁμοούσιος, Ἄπειρος, Ἡμιάπειρος, Πνεῦμα (c), πνευματόμαχος, &c.*, in Suicer’s *Thesaurus*.

³ See Suicer, s. v. *Τριθεΐται*, and Mosheim, Cent. vi. Pt. ii. ch. v. § 10.

⁴ Mosheim, Cent. xvi. § 3, Pt. ii. ch. iv.

Son and of the Spirit, making Jesus Christ but a prophet of God.

In the mean time, Lælius and Faustus Socinus constructed the system which bears their name. They were natives of Tuscany, which they left from hatred to Romanism; and Faustus, after his uncle's death, joined the Unitarians of Poland, and there taught his doctrines, which soon spread into Hungary, Holland, and England. He professed that Luther had begun, but that he would perfect the Reformation; which was incomplete, whilst any doctrine, which Rome had held, remained to be believed. His fundamental error was, that Scripture should be received as truth, but be made to bend to reason. He taught that Jesus was born of a virgin, and having been translated to heaven, was instructed in God's will, and endued with that portion of the Divine power, called the Holy Ghost. He then came down as a teacher of righteousness. Those who obey him shall be saved. The disobedient shall be tormented for a time, and then annihilated. In a certain sense, Socinus allowed Christ to be called God, and worshipped. But his followers have generally looked on Him as a mere man, following herein that sect of Socinians, whose first leader was Budnæus¹.

In the Reformed Church of England, in the beginning of the eighteenth century, Mr. Whiston, Professor of Mathematics at Cambridge, adopted and maintained the Arian doctrine, or a slight modification of it. And Dr. Samuel Clarke, a man of learning and unblemished character, maintained the subordination of the Persons in the Godhead in so objectionable a form, as to lay himself open to the charge of Arianism, or semi-Arianism. The masterly works of Waterland on the Trinity were many of them called forth by the unsound views of Dr. Clarke.

¹ Mosheim, Cent. xvi. § 3, Pt. II. ch. iv.; also Cent. xvii. § 2, Pt. II. ch. vi.

Later in the century, Priestley advocated with learning and skill the far more heretical doctrines of the Socinians, or rather of the pure humanitarians. Those writings of Bishop Horsley are considered as of most value which are directed against Priestley.

It has been observed, that the various bodies of Presbyterian Christians, both in Great Britain and on the continent, have had a considerable tendency to lapse into Socinianism, with the exception of the Kirk of Scotland, which has maintained a most honourable superiority to all other Presbyterians, partly, no doubt, because—unlike the generality of them—she strictly guards the Creeds of the Church, and other formularies of the faith.

In Germany and Switzerland the rationalism, which so generally prevails among foreign Protestants, has been favourable to Unitarian views of the Godhead, and humanitarian doctrines concerning Christ.

SECTION II.

SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

HAVING thus far given a history of the doctrine contained in this Article, I proceed to the proof from Scripture.

So much of the subject may seem to belong to natural religion, that we might easily be tempted to begin with proofs from reason alone. It appears to me, however, that, as a Christian Church presupposes acceptance of the Christian revelation, the proper way of treating the symbols and articles of a church is to prove them from the authentic records of that revelation. The proofs from reason belong rather to the department of Christian evidences. Yet thus much perhaps it may be necessary to premise; that the mystery of the doctrines, contained in this article, should be considered as no argument against their truth. For, as, with all our study, we can scarce attain to any clear understanding of the mode in which we exist ourselves; reason alone should teach us to look upon it as hardly likely, that, with any searching, we could find out God. The mode of His subsistence, who is infinitely above us, may probably enough be infinitely above our powers to comprehend.

According then to the division of the subject proposed above, we have to shew,

FIRST, in opposition to Anthropomorphites, that ‘God is a Spirit without body, parts, and passions.’

SECONDLY, in opposition to Pantheists, that God is a personal, living, Being—‘living and true, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, Maker and Preserver of all things, visible and invisible;’ ‘everlasting.’

THIRDLY, in opposition to Tritheists, Arians, and every kind of Polytheists, that God is One.

FOURTHLY, in opposition to Arians, Sabellians, Macedonians, Socinians, &c. that, 'in the Unity of the Godhead there are three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.'

I shall consider it sufficient to establish the doctrines, contained in the first three of the foregoing propositions, by simply referring to some of the many texts of Scripture, by which they may be proved; reserving for the fourth and last any more extended arguments.

FIRST, then, 'God is a Spirit, without body, parts, and passions.' Joh. iv. 24. Comp. Isai. xl. 18, 25. Deut. iv. 15. Joh. i. 18; v. 37. Acts xvii. 24, 28, 29. Rom. i. 20, 21. 1 Tim. i. 17; vi. 16.

'Without passions' may be inferred from Num. xxiii. 19. Mal. iii. 6. Heb. vi. 17, 18. James i. 13, 17.

It is perhaps hardly necessary to add that, whereas God is often spoken of in terms which express bodily relations, it is that the Infinite may in some degree be made intelligible to the finite; the Almighty having been pleased to condescend to our infirmities, and to deal with us as parents do with their children, teaching them by such figures and modes of instruction as their tender minds will bear.

SECONDLY. God is

1 'Living and true.'

Exod. iii. 6, 14, 15; vi. 2, 3. Num. xxvii. 16. Deut. v. 26. Josh. iii. 10. 1 Sam. xvii. 26. Ps. xlii. 2; lxxxiv. 2. Isai. xlii. 8. Jer. x. 10. Dan. xi. 26. Matt. xvi. 16. Joh. xvii. 3. Acts xiv. 15. Rom. ix. 26. 2 Cor. vi. 16. 1 Thess. i. 9. 1 Tim. iv. 10; vi. 16. Heb. x. 31. Rev. iv. 8; x. 5, 6.

2 'Of infinite power.'

Gen. xvii. 1; xviii. 14. Job xlii. 2. Jer. xxxii. 17, 27. Matt. xix. 26. Eph. iii. 20. Rev. ix. 11; xix. 6.

3 'Wisdom.'

Gen. xvi. 13. 1 Sam. ii. 3. 1 Kings viii. 39. Job xxvi. 6; xxviii. 10, 23, 24; xxxiv. 21. Psal. xlv. 21; xciv. 9; cxxxix. 4. Prov. xv. 3. Jer. xxiii. 23, 24. Dan. ii. 22, 28. Acts xv. 18. Rom. xi. 33; xvi. 27. Heb. iv. 13. 1 Joh. i. 5. Jude 25.

4 'Goodness.'

Ex. xv. 11; xxxiv. 6. Lev. xi. 44. Deut. iv. 31. 1 Sam. ii. 2. Psal. lxxxvi. 15; cxviii. 1; cxlv. 8. Isai. vi. 3. Dan. ix. 9. Joel ii. 13. Jonah iv. 2. Mic. vii. 18. Luke i. 77, 78. Rom. ii. 4. 2 Cor. i. 3. Eph. ii. 4. Heb. vi. 10. 2 Pet. iii. 15. 1 Joh. iv. 8. Rev. xv. 3.

5 'Maker of all things, visible and invisible.'

Gen. i. 2. 2 Kings xix. 15. Neh. ix. 6. Psal. xxxiii. 6; c. 3; cxxxv. 6. Acts xvii. 24. Eph. iii. 9. Col. i. 16. Heb. iii. 4. Rev. iv. 11; x. 6.

6 'Preserver of all things.'

Deut. xxxii. 39, &c. 1 Sam. ii. 2. 1 Chron. xxix. 11, 12. Job xii. 9. Psal. xxii. 28; lxxv. 6, 7; xc. 3; xcv. 3, 4, 5, 7. Isai. xiv. 27; xl. 11, 12, 13, 15, 22. Jer. v. 24; xviii. 6—9. Dan. v. 23. Matt. vi. 25—30; x. 29, 30. Rom. xi. 36. Eph. i. 11.

7 'Everlasting.'

Gen. xxi. 33. Deut. xxxiii. 27. Psal. ix. 7; xc. 2, 4; cii. 12, 26, 27. Isai. xlv. 6; lvii. 15. Lam. v. 19. Rom. i. 20; xvi. 26. 1 Tim. i. 17. Rev. i. 8; v. 14; x. 6.

THIRDLY. We have to shew in opposition to Tritheists, Arians, and every kind of Polytheists, that 'God is One.' 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord' (Deut. vi. 4). 'The Lord, He is God, there is none else beside Him' (Deut. iv. 35). 'Thus saith the Lord...Beside Me there is no God' (Is. xlv. 6; comp. v. 8). 'There is one God, and there is none other but

He' (Mark xii. 32). 'The only true God' (Joh. xvii. 3). 'We know that there is none other God but One' (1 Cor. viii. 4). 'God is One' (Gal. iii. 20). 'There is One God, and one Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus' (1 Tim. ii. 5). 'Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well' (Jam. ii. 19). 'Denying the only Lord God' (Jude 4). 'The only wise God, our Saviour' (Jude 25).

See also Ex. xx. 3. 2 Sam. xxii. 32. Psal. lxxxvi. 10. Isai. xxxvii. 16; xlii. 8. Mark xii. 29. 1 Cor. viii. 6. Eph. iv. 6.

FOURTHLY. We have to shew, in opposition to Sabellians, Arians, Macedonians, Socinians, &c., that 'In the Unity of the Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity,—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.'

As regards this doctrine of the Trinity in Unity, we must not expect to find the same express declarations in Scripture that we find, for instance, of the facts, that 'God is a Spirit,' 'God is a righteous God,' or the like. But it by no means therefore follows, that the one is less true than the other. It appears to have been far from the design of the Author of Holy Scripture to set down every article of Christian truth in the form of a distinct enunciation. Scripture is not a system of catechetical instruction, designed to lead us, step by step, to the knowledge of religious verities, and to place every thing so clearly before us that, if we will, we cannot mistake it. On the contrary, it is plainly intended that, if we do not fear the Lord, we shall not be able to penetrate His secret, and that unless our hearts are set to do His will, we shall not be able to know of His doctrine. If there were no other reason than this, we might see why many things in Scripture require to be sought out.

But again, God has appointed various instruments for instruction in His Church; all, of course, in subordination to the teaching of His Holy Spirit. He has bestowed upon us, first, reason, secondly, Scripture, thirdly, the ministry of His word

and sacraments. If Scripture were a regular course of catechetical teaching, so plain that it could not be mistaken, the prophetic or didactic office of the Church and the ministry would be altogether superseded. Again, it is evidently desirable that our reason, enlightened by God's Spirit, should be exercised to the understanding of His word; and one great blessing derived from this appointment is, that so, whilst the ignorant may find enough to guide them safe, the most profound and acutest intellect may find abundance to employ its meditations, and exercise its thoughts. Else, what was suited for the one, might pall upon the taste of the other.

Believing, then, that we are not only permitted, but called upon, in humble dependence on the Divine guidance, to use our reason, dispassionately but reverently, in order to understand what God has delivered to us; I shall endeavour to class together the various facts which Scripture has recorded concerning the nature of God, so far as they bear on this part of our subject; and then, by the common process of induction, shall hope to arrive at a just conclusion from a general view of them all.

Now these different facts of Scripture may be classed under four heads.

I. Scripture teaches that there is One God.

II. There is nevertheless clear *intimation* of some kind of plurality in the Godhead, even in the Old Testament; but in the New Testament there is a clear *declaration* that

The Father is God,
The Son is God,
The Holy Ghost is God.

III. This fact of the plurality is not in express terms a contradiction of the Unity; such as would be the case if in

one passage it were said, 'There is one God,' and in another passage, 'There are three Gods;' for it appears from Scripture that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are but one and the same God.

IV. Still, though Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are but one God; there is plain evidence from Scripture, that the Father is not the Son, nor is either of them the Holy Ghost; but that they are clearly distinguished from one another, and distinguished too as *Personal* Agents, not merely as modes, operations, or attributes.

If I find these four propositions clearly established in Scripture, I do not know what more can be required to prove the doctrine of this Article, that 'in the Unity of the Godhead there be three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost;' and that these three Persons are 'of one substance, power, and eternity.'

I. In the first place, then, Scripture teaches us, that there is but one God. This has been already shewn in the **THIRD** principal division of the subject. It is revealed as the fundamental truth of all religion. Whatever contradicts this truth is evident falsehood. Therefore Tritheism, which speaks of the Father, Son, and Spirit as three Gods is false. Therefore Arianism, which speaks of the Father as the supreme God, and of the Son as another inferior, subordinate God, is false. Therefore every kind of Polytheism is false; for 'there is one God, and there is none other but He.' Mark xii. 32.

II. But next, plain as is this doctrine of the Unity of the Godhead, there are (1) in the Old Testament decided *intimations* of a plurality in the Godhead, and (2) in the New Testament express *declarations* that

The Father is God,
The Son is God,
And the Holy Ghost is God.

(1) In the Old Testament there are decided intimations of a plurality in the Godhead.

The Jews indeed were placed in the midst of idolaters, themselves easily tempted to idolatry, and being subjects of a carnal dispensation, were but little capable of embracing spiritual truth. It may therefore probably have been in mercy, to prevent the danger of Tritheism, that the doctrine of the Unity was so strongly insisted on, and so little said of a Trinity or plurality of Persons. Yet *intimations* are not wanting.

I do not insist on the plural form of the name of God, because the Hebrews used plurals at times to express greatness or intensity; and such may have been the force of the plural in the name *Elohim*.

But in the history of the Creation (Gen. i. 26, 27) it is certainly remarkable that God said, 'Let *us* make man in *our* image;' and then it is added, 'So God created man in *His* image.' This is the more remarkable, if we compare with it what is said by St. Paul (Col. i. 15; Heb. i. 2, &c.), viz. that God made all things *by His Son*. The same plural expression occurs after the fall; when God says, 'The man is become as one of *us*;' and at the confusion of Babel, 'Let *us* go down and confound their language.' We cannot conceive the infinite Creator of all things thus coupling any finite creature with Himself.

Again, in the Old Testament there are various manifestations of God, which at one time are spoken of as manifestations of God Himself, at another as manifestations of a Messenger or Angel sent by God: as though God were at once the Sender and the Sent—the God of Angels and the Angel of God.

This may be observed of the wrestling of Jacob with the

Angel (Gen. xxxii. 24). In Genesis it is said Jacob wrestled with a *man*; but he called the place 'Peniel, because he had seen *God* face to face'—(ver. 30): and where the same is referred to by (Hosea xii. 3, 4), it is first said, 'He had power with *God*,' and then in the next verse, 'He had power over the *Angel*, and prevailed.'

In Joshua (v. 14), One appears to Joshua, who calls Himself 'the Captain of the Lord's host.' Yet three verses further (ch. vi. 2), when the Captain of the Lord's host speaks to Joshua, the name by which He is called is the LORD, (*i. e.* JEHOVAH). From this we infer that He, who came as the Captain of JEHOVAH's host, was also Himself JEHOVAH¹.

In the second chapter of Judges, the *Angel* of the LORD appears to speak with full authority, as if He were the LORD Himself. 'I made you go up out of Egypt.' 'I said, I will never break *My* covenant with you.' Ver. 1.

The history of Manoah and the Angel (Judg. xiii. comp. vv. 20, 21, 22, 23) seems to teach the same thing.

But not only is One, who is sent by the Lord as His Angel, called by the highest name of God, viz. JEHOVAH; but also there is indication of the clearest kind in the Old Testament, that One, who should be sent on earth by God, as a man, to suffer, and to deliver, is also the Fellow of God, and God Himself. Thus, in Jeremiah (xxiii. 6), the Messiah's name is called 'JEHOVAH our Righteousness.' In Isaiah (vii. 14), it is called 'God with us.' In Malachi (iii. 1), we are told 'The LORD whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to His temple, even the Messenger of the Covenant whom ye delight in,'—language clearly used of the Messiah, but as clearly most suitable to God. In Isaiah (ix. 6), the Child, who is to be born as a Redeemer, is expressly called 'The Mighty God.' In Zechariah (xiii. 7),

¹ Compare Ex. xxiii. 20, 21, where the angel, whom God sends before the Israelites, seems plainly by ver. 21, to be God.

in a prophecy of salvation by the Christ, we read, 'Awake, O sword, against My Shepherd, and against the Man that is My Fellow, saith the Lord of hosts.'

I forbear to adduce such passages, as those, where the Wisdom, or the Word of God, are spoken of with personal attributes (*e.g.* Prov. viii. ver. 22, 23, 24, 30, 31. Psal. xxxiii. 6. Isai. xlviii. 16); because we cannot be certain that in these cases personal attributes are not ascribed by the figure called *Prosopopœia*. But it is hard to explain how God in creation can use the plural number, speaking as to another, with whom He was, as it were, acting in concert—how the same Person can be both JEHOVAH and sent as JEHOVAH's Angel, Captain or Messenger,—how the same Person can be sent on earth as Messiah, and yet be the mighty God—how God can speak of the Man that is His Fellow—without supposing that some sort of plurality in the Godhead is implied.

I conclude therefore that in the Old Testament there are distinct *intimations* of a plurality in the Godhead.

(2) But next, in the New Testament, there are not only intimations of a plurality (such as the very use of the names Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and their conjunction in numerous passages plainly imply), but farther it is *distinctly taught* us

- 1 That the FATHER is God,
- 2 That the SON is God,
- 3 That the HOLY GHOST is God.

1 That we are taught the FATHER is God no one can doubt. So strong indeed are the expressions concerning the Father as God, that, if they stood alone, we should naturally conclude that the Father alone was God, and that, as there is but One God, so there was but one Person in the Godhead. Thus our Lord says (John viii. 54), 'My Father, of whom ye say that He is your God.' Again, addressing the Father, He says, 'This is life eternal, to know Thee the only true God' (John

xvii. 3). St. Paul speaks (Eph. iv. 6) of ‘One God and Father of all.’ And again, ‘To us there is one God, the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ’ (1 Cor. viii. 6). The consideration of this apparent exclusion of the Son and the Spirit from the Godhead must be reserved, till we come to speak of the eternal Generation of the Son and of the Procession of the Holy Ghost. At present we have only to observe, that such texts prove, with peculiar force, our first assertion, that the Father is God.

2 We learn also from the teaching of the new Testament that the Son is God. And this fact we deduce both from *reasonable inference*, and from *direct statement*.

Our *reasonable inference* is of the following kind.

We often meet with passages in the old Testament, which speak plainly of the Most High God, applied as plainly in the new Testament to Jesus Christ, the Son of God. For example, in Isaiah xl. 3, it is said that “the voice of one crying in the wilderness shall prepare the way of JEHOVAH, and make straight in the desert a highway for our God.” But in each one of the Evangelists this passage is quoted. The ‘Voice’ is said to be John the Baptist; and He, for whom he prepares the way, is said to be Christ¹. Is not the natural and necessary inference, that Christ is as much ‘our God’ and ‘JEHOVAH,’ as John was the voice in the wilderness?

Again, in Zech. xii. 4, 10, if we compare the one verse with the other, we shall see that it is written, ‘In that day, saith JEHOVAH...they shall look on Me whom they have pierced.’ But St. John (xix. 37) tells us that this prophecy was concerning the piercing of *Christ*. Therefore we must conclude that Christ is JEHOVAH.

Once more, in Isaiah vi. the prophet sees the Lord sitting upon His throne, even ‘the King, JEHOVAH of hosts.’ (ver. 5.)

¹ Matt. iii. 3; Mark i. 3; Luke iii. 4; John i. 23.

But St. John (xii. compare vv. 37—41) says that the Lord, whose glory Isaiah then saw, was *Jesus Christ*.

Another reason why we *infer* that the Son is God, is that the worship due to God is offered to Him, the peculiar attributes of God are ascribed to Him, and the power of God is exerted by Him.

(1) He receives worship as God, and is prayed to.

See Matt. ii. 11; viii. 2; ix. 18; xiv. 33; xv. 25; xx. 20; xxviii. 9. Mark v. 6; ix. 24. Luke xxiii. 42. John ix. 38. Acts vii. 59. 1 Thess. iii. 11. Heb. i. 6. Rev. v. 8, 12, 13.

Whereas saints and angels universally refuse worship offered to them, and bid us worship none but God. Acts x. 26; xiv. 14, 15. Rev. xix. 10; xxii. 9.

(2) The peculiar attributes of God are ascribed to Him.

α. He is eternal, existing from everlasting to everlasting.

Micah v. 2. John i. 1, 3; viii. 58. Col. i. 16, 17. Heb. i. 8, 10, 11, 12; vii. 3; xiii. 8. Rev. i. comp. vv. 8, 11, 12, 13, 18, (which comparison will shew that the language is all used of Jesus Christ); xxii. 13.

It may be added that several of the above passages shew that He is not only eternal, but unchangeable, *e. g.* Heb. i. 10, 11; xiii. 8.

β. He knows the thoughts, yea, all things.

Matt. ix. 4; xii. 25. Luke vi. 8; ix. 47; xi. 17. John i. 48; xvi. 30; xxi. 17. Col. ii. 3. Rev. ii. 23.

Those of the above passages, which shew that Jesus Christ knew the thoughts of the heart, should be compared with such as the following: Jer. xvii. 10, 'I the Lord search the heart.' Acts xv. 8, 'God, which knoweth the hearts' (ὁ καρδιογνώστης Θεός), and 1 Kings viii. 39, 'Thou, even Thou ONLY knowest the hearts of all the children of men¹.'

¹ The objections to Christ's omniscience, taken from John viii. 28; Rev.

γ. He is everywhere present.

Matt. xviii. 20 ; xxviii. 20. John i. 48 ; iii. 13.

The last passage especially shews, that whilst He was on earth, He was still in Heaven.

δ. He is self-existent, like the Father, having derived from the Father the same eternal nature with Himself.

John v. 26. Compare John xi. 25 ; xiv. 6. See also John i. 4 ; x. 30 ; xiv. 10. Phil. ii. 6.¹

(3) The power of God is exerted by Him.

α. He is Lord of the Sabbath, which God ordained, and none but God can change.

Comp. Gen. ii. 2, 3 with Mark ii. 28. Luke vi. 5.

β. He sends His angels as God.

Matt. xiii. 41. Rev. i. 1 ; xxii. 6.

γ. He has power to forgive sins, as God.

Matt. ix. 2—6. Mark ii. 5, 7, 10. Luke v. 20—24 ; vii. 48.

Whereas, when forgiveness is merely ministerial or ecclesiastical, the power is conferred by Him, and exercised in His name. Comp. John xx. 23 with 2 Cor. ii. 10.

δ. He shall judge the world.

Job xix. 25. Matt. xiii. 40 ; xvi. 27 ; xxv. 31. John v. 22, 23. Acts x. 42. 2 Cor. v. 10.

ε. He created and preserves all things².

John i. 3, 10. Eph. iii. 9. Col. i. 16. Heb. i. 2, 3, 10, 11, 12.

i. 1 ; Mark xiii. 32 ; are answered by Waterland, *Moyer's Lecture*, Serm. vii., *Works*, Vol. ii. p. 160. See the latter passage considered below, under Art. iv.

¹ On Phil. ii. 6, see Pearson, *On the Creed*, fol. p. 121.

² On the proof of Christ's proper Deity from creation, see Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 112 ; Waterland, *Works* (Oxf. 1823,) Vol. ii. 2nd and 3rd Sermons at Lady Moyer's Lecture.

With these passages compare Isaiah xliv. 24, 'Thus saith the LORD (*i. e.* JEHOVAH), 'I am the LORD that maketh all things; that stretcheth forth the heavens *alone*; that spreadeth abroad the earth by MYSELF.'

ζ. He has all power in heaven and earth.

Matt. xxviii. 18. Mark i. 27. John iii. 31, 35; v. 19, 21; xvi. 15. Acts x. 36. Rom. xiv. 9. Eph. i. 20—23. Phil. ii. 10; iii. 21. Heb. vii. 26. 1 Pet. iii. 21, 22. Rev. i. 5, 8.

Thus far then we have seen that passages in the old Testament, spoken of God, are in the new Testament applied to Christ, the Son of God; that the worship due to God is offered to the Son; that the peculiar attributes of God are ascribed to the Son; that the power of God is exerted by the Son. If we had nothing more than this, surely our natural and necessary *inference* must be that the Son is God.

But we are not left to the *inference* of our reason only on this momentous subject. We have also *direct statement*, and that many times repeated, that Christ, the Son of God, is God.

And here we may recur, for a moment, to what was said concerning intimations of a plurality in the Godhead in the old Testament. Some of the passages there referred to, when seen in the light cast upon them by the new Testament, become direct assertions of the Godhead of Christ.

The prophecy in the seventh chapter of Isaiah, that a Virgin should bear a Son, whose name should be called Immanuel, *i. e.* God with us, is, in the first chapter of St. Matthew, distinctly interpreted of the birth of Jesus Christ. Therefore St. Matthew distinctly declares to us that Jesus Christ is Emmanuel, God with us. Again, in the ninth chapter of Isaiah, which is a continuation of the prophecy in the seventh chapter, the Child that was to be born is called 'Wonderful, Counsellor, *the Mighty God*, the Everlasting Father.' This prophecy too is by St. Matthew expressly interpreted of the

Lord Jesus. (See Matt. iv. 16, which compare with Isai. ix. 1, 2.) We have then the express assurance of the Evangelist, that Jesus Christ was called in the old Testament, Immanuel, and the Mighty God.

We might add to these examples the language of Zechariah (xiii. 7), where the Lord's 'Shepherd' is called His 'Fellow;' and that of Jeremiah (xxiii. 6), where the 'Branch,' that should be raised to David, is called 'Jehovah our Righteousness¹;' because both these passages are unquestionable prophecies of Christ, though not so distinctly referred to by the Evangelists.

The first chapter of St. John begins with a declaration of the Divinity of the Son of God. From whatever source St. John derived the use of the term 'the Word of God;' whether he used language already familiar to the Jews, or, as is perhaps more probable, adopted the phrase of Platonizing heretics²; it is quite plain that by the 'Word' he means the Son of God, who was incarnate in Jesus Christ. This is proved by Rev. xix. 13, where it is said of Jesus Christ that 'His Name is called the Word of God;' and again, by the 14th verse of the first chapter of St. John's Gospel, where we read, 'The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the Only-begotten of the Father.' Of this Word of God then, who was the Only-begotten of the Father, and when made flesh, was called Jesus Christ, we are told (John i. 1), 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.' Language cannot more strongly express the Deity of the Son of God, the Word of God. Yet, lest mistake should occur, the Evangelist adds a sentence which at once declares that the Word was uncreated, and was Himself the Creator of all things, exercising that, the highest act of Almighty power. 'All things were made by Him, and with-

¹ On this passage see Pearson, *On the Creed*, fol. p. 148, Note.

² See § 1. *Historical View*.

out Him was not any thing made that was made.' If no created thing was made but by Him, then was He himself uncreated, and so He must be the eternal, uncreated Maker of the universe.

In the eighth Chapter of the same Gospel, we find our Lord taking to Himself one of the most special names of God. God had first revealed Himself to Moses by the name 'I AM.' Here then, Christ having declared himself the Son of God, having assured the Jews that Abraham had seen His day and rejoiced; when they doubted the possibility of His having seen Abraham, He adds, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I AM.' Had He merely spoken of His pre-existence, the past tense would have seemed more natural. But he uses that tense, which expresses the existence of none but God—an unchanging present, which has no future nor past—and so adopts, as His own, the name of the self-existent JEHOVAH. That the Jews so understood Him is apparent from the fact, that, though they bore with Him, whilst He called Himself God's Son, as soon as He had uttered the words 'Before Abraham was, I am,' they took up stones to cast at Him.

Again, (John xx. 28,) when Thomas is convinced of Christ's resurrection, he is therewith, though not till then, convinced of Christ's Divinity: for He immediately 'said unto Him, My Lord and My God¹.'

Another important passage is that in the ninth chapter of Romans, ver. 5: where St. Paul, speaking of the Jews, says that of them, 'as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God, blessed for ever.' In this verse there is as it were proof upon proof, that Christ is God. First, the expression 'as concerning the flesh,' indicates that according to something

¹ The objections which have been made to the plain sense of this passage may be seen fully replied to; Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 131; and Middleton, *On the Article*, in loc.

higher than the flesh, He had His Being elsewhere. Next, He is said to be ἐπὶ πάντων, 'over all;' as John the Baptist said of Him (John iii. 31). 'He that cometh from above is above all.' The very same epithet (ἐπὶ πάντων) is applied, Eph. iv. 6, to God the Father; nor can we conceive it to be of less significance than that similar title of God, (עליון ὑψιστος) 'the *Most High*.' Next comes the name, (Θεός) *God*, which is in every manuscript and every version. Lastly, the whole is concluded by the words 'Blessed for ever,' a phrase which is a translation, or paraphrase of a well known Jewish form used only in speaking of the Almighty: (הַקְדוֹשׁ בְּרַךְ הוּא)¹.

Again, in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Colossians, ver. 9, St. Paul says of Christ, that 'in Him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.' The Gnostics made a fulness (pleroma) of numerous Æons, or emanations from God, and one of these emanations they believed to dwell in Jesus. The Apostle says, however, that it was no single Æon, no mere emanation from God: but the whole Pleroma, the fulness of God, dwelt in him bodily².

The first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, besides ascribing Creation and Providence to the Son of God, besides saying that all the Angels should worship Him, distinctly applies to Him the name of God. It is thus the Apostle quotes the Psalms: 'To the Son He saith, Thy Throne, O God, is for

¹ All MSS. all VSS. have the verse entire. All the fathers have it, except that in Cyprian, Hilary, and Leo it is referred to without Θεός. Such an exception will be very far from invalidating the reading; but Erasmus observes that without Θεός, the verse would still prove the Divinity. See the passage fully considered—Pearson, p. 132; Waterland, Vol. II. p. 133; Middleton, *On the Article*, in loc.; Magee, *On Atonement*, Vol. III. p. 91. The Arian interpretation, which would make the latter part of the verse a doxology to the Father, is considered and refuted very fully by Bp. Middleton.

² See Whitby on this passage. His Notes on the Colossians are very good.

ever and ever.' And again, 'Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth.'

Let us next take the important passage in the Epistle to the Philippians (ii. 5—9). The Apostle exhorts the Philippians to humility by the example of the incarnate Son of God. 'Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of man; and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.' There are two ways in which this passage, or at least one phrase of it (*οὐχ ἄρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο*), may be translated; one, as in our version; the other (as Origen, Novatian, and many after them have interpreted it) 'did not pique Himself on this His dignity;' or, 'did not covet and earnestly desire to be so honoured'. It does not appear that one of these renderings is more calculated to weaken the force of the passage than the

¹ Ὃς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, οὐχ ἄρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, μορφὴν δούλου λάβων, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, καὶ σχήματι εὐρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν, γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ. 'Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; (or, did not parade, covet, or pique Himself on the being equal with God) but emptied Himself (of His glory) by taking the form of a servant, (and that) by being made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself by becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.' The participles express the manner in which the actions of the verbs were effected. He, being in the form of God, emptied Himself of His divine glory. How? Why, by taking the form of a servant. And how did He take the form of a servant? By being made in the likeness of men. And then, being no longer in the glory of God, but in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself. How? By becoming obedient unto death.

Hence it appears that, as He humbled Himself by becoming obedient to death, so He emptied Himself by taking the form of a servant, and He took the form of a servant by being made man. The taking the form of a servant then, was the becoming man, the assuming human nature: 'the

other. Both of them are intelligible, if we admit that St. Paul is speaking of Christ as God ; both unintelligible on every other hypothesis.

The Arians indeed interpret the ‘being in the form of God,’ not as though it meant being in the ‘nature of God,’ but as though it were intended to signify that Christ, before His incarnation, acting under the old Testament, as God’s Angel, and Messenger, *represented* and *personated* God ; and so might be *said* to be in the form of God. They would therefore explain it, ‘that Christ having been sent as God’s messenger, and permitted to personate and represent God, yet did not arrogate to Himself to be equal with God.’ But it must be observed, that if this were the right sense of the passage, then also the phrase ‘taking the form of a servant’ should mean, not the *becoming really* man, but merely personating or *appearing in the semblance* of a man ; which sense of the passage might be correct, if the writer had been a Gnostic ; not, as it was St Paul. But as the ‘taking on Him the form of a servant’ must mean that He was *truly* man ; so the ‘being in the form of God’ must mean that He was *truly* God. It must be observed again, that, as the Apostle distinctly tells us, that Christ took the form of a servant by being made in the likeness of men ; it is therefore quite plain that, before He was made in the likeness of men, He was *not* in the form of a servant. But who of all created beings is not in the form of a servant ? Who, but the uncreated God, is not a servant of God ? If then Christ

form of a servant’ was the nature of man. It follows, that the ‘form of God’ was the nature of God.

It must be admitted that οὐχ ἀπαγγέλλον ἑγῆσαστο, is an unusual expression ; but to the interpretation ‘did not make a parade of, or pique Himself on the being equal with God,’ the few parallel expressions which are to be found seem most favourable.

On the whole passage see Grotius, Hammond, Whitby, Macknight, Rosenmüller, Middleton, in loc., Suicer, s. v. ἀπαγγέλλω ; Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 122, fol. ; Waterland, Vol. II. Serm. v. p. 89.

was, before His incarnation, not a servant, nor in the form of a servant; then, before His incarnation, He must have been God.

The passage then requires us to interpret it as follows. 'Take, for your example of humility, Jesus Christ. He, being in the form and nature of God, thought it not robbery to be (or, piqued not Himself on being) equal with God; but emptied Himself of His Divine glory, inasmuch as He, being Lord of all, yet assumed the form of a servant, by being made in likeness of men; and when He was thus found in fashion no longer as God, but as man, He humbled Himself yet further, by becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.'

In the famous passage in 1 Tim. iii. 16, we read, 'God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.' It is indeed true that there are three readings of the first word, which is in our version *God*. Yet of these three readings the authority of MSS. is immensely in favour of that commonly received; and even if either of the others were the true reading, which is not for a moment to be admitted as probable, the context implies the Deity of Him of whom they speak¹.

¹ Dr Berriman (*Crit. Dis.* on 1 Tim. iii. 16) specifies ninety-one MSS. which read Θεός. The reading of the Alexandrian is doubted, but it is almost proved that it was Θεός. See Nolan, *On the Greek Vulgate*, pp. 285, 512, (Lond. 1815). There is a similar doubt concerning the reading of the *Codex Ephrem.* (Griesbach's C.) whether the reading was originally ὁς or Θεός. If we except these, only F, G, 17, 73 of Griesbach's have the reading ὁς, and only one (D, the *Codex Claromontanus*) has the reading δ, (see Griesbach, in h. l.). It is well known that the way in which the one reading may have been substituted for the other was this. In the uncial MSS. (or MSS. written with capital letters) Θεός was written thus, ΘC. This has but two strokes of difference from OC, i. e. ὁς, a transcriber might have omitted these strokes inadvertently. If the change was intentional, it is most probable that ΘC was altered to OC from fear of Sabellianism, and from supposed resemblance to Col. i. 26, 27, (See Nolan, p. 281).

There is another passage, in Acts xx. 28, which I couple with the last, because here too the reading is in doubt. St. Paul exhorts the elders of Ephesus 'to feed the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood¹.' So strongly does this speak, and so plainly assert the Deity of Christ, that the fathers, as early as Ignatius, who was a contemporary of the Apostles, considered themselves sanctioned by these words to use the remarkable expressions, 'the blood of God,' and, 'the passion of God².'

St. Peter (2 Pet. i. 1) speaks 'of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ;' St. Jude, 'of our only Lord God, even our Lord Jesus Christ,' Jude 4. Compare Eph. v. 5; 2 Thess. i. 12; Tit. ii. 13.³

Lastly, St. John (1 John v. 20) distinctly calls Jesus Christ 'the true God.' 'We are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ. This (οὗτος) is the true God, and eternal life.' The pronoun 'this' (οὗτος), in all propriety of speech, should refer to the last antecedent, Jesus Christ. Hence, literally and grammatically, the passage teaches, that Christ is the true God. But also the context shews that it is of Him, and not of the Father, that St. John makes this statement. Our Lord is called by Himself, and by His Apostle St. John, 'the

¹ Θεοῦ is the reading of Cod. Vat. and seventeen other MSS., two of the Peschito, Vulg. Æthiop. Athanasius, Tertullian, &c. Κυρίου is the reading of Cod. Alex. Beza: and fourteen others. Copt. Sahid. Armen. Eusebius, &c. The fathers' authority is greatly for the first. The three readings Θεοῦ, Κυρίου, and Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ, are nearly equally supported by MSS. The VSS. in number are nearly equal for Θεοῦ and Κυρίου; those of greater authority favour Θεοῦ.

The phrase Ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ occurs eleven times in St Paul's writings, Ἐκκλησία τοῦ Κυρίου, never. See also Bp. Middleton in loc.; Burton's *Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers*, p. 15.

² Ignat. *ad Ephes.* i. μιμηταὶ ὄντες Θεοῦ, ἀναζωπυρήσαντες ἐν αἵματι Θεοῦ.

³ This is, of course, assuming Mr Granville Sharp's *Canon on the Articles* to be established. See Middleton, Pt. I. ch. III. Sect. IV. § 2; and upon the five passages quoted and referred to in the text; also Waterland, Vol. II. p. 128.

Life,' 'the Life of men.' Throughout the chapter the Apostle has been urging that eternal *life* is in the Son of God. Hence, when He has said all He has to say on the subject, he concludes with once more assuring us that Jesus Christ is both 'the true God and eternal Life.' So cogent has this argument appeared, that some Arians have admitted that eternal life was meant of the Son, whilst the true God was meant of the Father. But it can never be denied that οὗτος, *this*, is equally the subject of both the predicates, *true God*, and *eternal life*. Therefore, if it be said, that *Christ is eternal life*; it is equally said, *Christ is the true God*. Lastly, there is no instance of the contrary interpretation in all antiquity, the objections being all modern, and of no weight in themselves¹.

We may now then fairly conclude, that Scripture furnishes us, both *by reasonable inference*, and *by direct statement*, with proof that the Son is God.

3 In the third place we learn also from Scripture that the HOLY GHOST is God.

Having found from the Scriptures that the Father is God, and that the Son is God, we shall need the less proof that He, whose name is constantly joined with them, is also God. Indeed but few will deny the Divinity, though they may doubt the Personality of the Holy Ghost. Yet, since in old times Arians, Macedonians and others appear to have held the strange notion that the Holy Spirit was a creature, it may be well to shew briefly that Scripture does speak of Him as God.

As is the case as regards the Son, so to the Spirit are ascribed the power and the attributes of God.

(1) He is the great Worker of Miracles.

Matt. i. 20; xii. 28. Luke iv. 1, 14. Acts ii. 4; x. 45. Rom. xv. 19. 1 Cor. xii. 4, 8. Heb. ii. 4.

¹ See Waterland, Vol. ii. p. 123.

(2) He is the Inspirer of Prophets, and can teach all things.

Mark xii. 36 ; xiii. 11. Luke i. 15—41 ; xii. 12. John xiv. 26 ; xvi. 13. Acts i. 8 ; viii. 29 ; x. 19, 20 ; xiii. 2 ; xxviii. 25. 1 Cor. ii. 13 ; xii. 11. Eph. iii. 5. Heb. iii. 7. 1 Pet. i. 11, 12. 2 Pet. i. 21.

(3) He dwells in temples as God.

1 Cor. iii. 16 ; vi. 19.

(4) He is the Source of all holiness.

John iii. 5. Rom. i. 4, 5 ; viii. 9, 14. 1 Cor. vi. 11. Gal. v. 16, &c. Compare Matt. xix. 17.

(5) He is Omnipresent and Omniscient.

Ps. cxxxix. 7. 1 Cor. ii. 10.

(6) He is represented as the Creator.

Gen. i. 2. Job xxvi. 13 ; xxxiii. 4. Ps. civ. 30, with which compare Is. xlv. 24. Mal. ii. 10.

(7) He is everlasting.

Heb. ix. 14.

(8) Sin against Him is so great, that, though blasphemy of all other kinds is pardonable, blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is unpardonable. Matt. xii. 31. Mark iii. 28. Luke xii. 10.

Thus are attributes and powers ascribed to the Holy Ghost, which can only be ascribed to God.

But moreover He is expressly called God.

In 2 Sam. xxiii. 2, 3, we read,

‘The Spirit of the Lord spake by me,

‘And His Word was in my tongue,

‘The God of Israel said,

‘The Rock of Israel spake to me.’

According to the usage of Hebrew poetry, it is unquestion-

able that 'the Spirit of the Lord' in the first verse is the same as 'the God of Israel' in the third.

In Matt. xii. 28, our Lord says, 'If I with the Spirit of God cast out devils.' The parallel passage, Luke xi. 20, has, 'If I with the finger of God cast out devils;' where the word 'finger,' like 'hand' in the old Testament, simply signifies *by* or *by means of*¹. So that here *God* and *the Spirit of God* are synonymous.

In Acts xxviii. 25, St. Paul quotes a passage thus, 'Well spake the *Holy Ghost* by the prophet Esaias.' The passage is from Isaiah vi. 9; which, if we refer to it in Isaiah, we shall find to have been unquestionably spoken by *God*.

In 1 Cor. iii. 16, we read, 'Ye are the temple of *God*.' In 1 Cor. vi. 19, the parallel passage, we find 'Your body is the temple of the *Holy Ghost*.'

In Exod. xxxiv., it is related that when Moses had gone up to talk with the Lord in Mount Sinai, the skin of his face shone so brightly, that, when he came to speak with the people, he was obliged to put a veil over his face, that they might be able to look on him; but, 'when he went in before the Lord.' (*i. e.* JEHOVAH), 'to speak with Him, he took the veil off until he came out,' ver. 34. Now in 2 Cor. iii. 16, 17, St. Paul alludes to this history, and plainly referring to this very verse, he says, When the heart of the Israelites 'shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away.' He then adds 'Now *the Lord*,' (*i. e.* the Lord, before whom Moses stood, and to whom the Israelites were to turn, *i. e.* JEHOVAH), 'is that Spirit.'

In Acts v. 3, 4, when Ananias had denied the truth before the Apostles, Peter said to Ananias, 'Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to *the Holy Ghost*?' And immediately after he adds, 'Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.' Plainly therefore the Holy Ghost is God.

¹ Thus בַּיַּד מֹשֶׁה 'By the hand of Moses,' means merely 'by Moses.'

Such are some of the passages of Scripture from which we may infallibly conclude, that,

As the FATHER is God,
And the SON is God,
So the HOLY GHOST is God.

III. Having shewn that God is One, and yet, as regards the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, it is said of each, that He is God; I propose next to shew, that these two truths are not direct contradictions to each other; as though it were said in one place, 'there is One God,' and in another, 'there are three Gods;' for it appears from Scripture that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are yet one and the same God.

1 It appears from Scripture that the Father is One with the Son. This is expressly declared by our Lord (John x. 30), 'I and My Father are One.' Again, He addresses the Father as being One with Him; and prays that His Church may be one Church in God, as He and His Father are One: 'that they all may be One, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us.' Again, that 'they may be one, even as we are one' (John xvii. 21, 22). Therefore it is that the Lord Jesus says of Himself, 'He that seeth Me, seeth Him that sent Me:' and in like manner He reproves His Apostle for asking to be shewn the Father, saying, 'Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known Me, Philip? he that hath seen Me, hath seen the Father: and how sayest thou then, Shew us the Father¹?'

2 That the Spirit of God is one with God the Father, is shewn by St. Paul, who compares the Spirit of God in God, to the Spirit of man in man (1 Cor. ii. 10, 11): 'What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.'

¹ John xiv. 9; see also Matth. x. 40; Mark ix. 37.

The passage in 2 Sam. xxiii. 2, 3, quoted above, where 'the Spirit of God spake by me' is synonymous with 'the God of Israel said,' is to the same effect.

3 That the Son and the Spirit are One, may appear from the fact that St. John says (xii. 37, 41), that the Lord, whose glory Isaiah saw in the vision recorded in his sixth chapter, was *the Son*, Jesus Christ; but St. Paul says (Acts xxviii. 25), that the Lord, who then spoke to Isaiah, was *the Holy Ghost*.

Again (in Matt. xi. 27) we read, 'No one knoweth the Father, but the *Son*.' Whereas, in 1 Cor. ii. 11, we are told that 'the things of God knoweth no man, but the *Spirit* of God.'

4 Accordingly we find that what the Father does, that the Son does, and that the Holy Ghost does; where the Father is, there the Son is, and there the Holy Ghost is, *e.g.*

The Father made the world. Heb. i. 2. 1 Cor. viii. 6.

The Son made the world. John i. 3. Col. i. 16. Heb. i. 2.

The Spirit made the world. Job xxvi. 13; xxxiii. 4.

Again,

The Father quickeneth. John v. 21.

The Son quickeneth whom He will. John v. 21.

It is the Spirit that quickeneth. John vi. 63.

Again,

God the Father spake by the prophets. Heb. i. 1.

God the Son spake by the prophets. 2 Cor. xiii. 3.

1 Pet. i. 11.

God the Holy Ghost spake by the prophets. Mark xiii.

11. 2 Pet. i. 21.

Again, sanctification is ascribed

To the Father. Jude 1.

To the Son. Heb. ii. 11.

To the Holy Ghost. Rom. xv. 16.¹

¹ See Jones' *Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity*.

Ordination is ascribed

To the Father. 2 Cor. iii. 5, 6.

To the Son. 1 Tim. i. 12.

To the Holy Ghost. Acts xx. 28.

Indwelling and presence in every Christian are ascribed

To the Father. John xiv. 23. 1 Cor. xiv. 5.

To the Son. John xiv. 23. 2 Cor. xiii. 5.

To the Holy Ghost. John xiv. 17.

From these considerations, and others like them, we naturally conclude that, though the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, yet are they not three different Gods, but one and the same God.

Those, indeed, who take the Arian view of the Scriptures, maintain that there is but one God, even the Father; but they add that the Son also is God, yet not the same God, but an inferior God to the Father, and so not of the same nature and substance with the Father. This is both self-contradictory and contradictory to Holy Scripture. First, it is self-contradictory, for it teaches that there is but one God, and yet that there are two Gods. Secondly, it is contradictory to Scripture; for it is opposed to the passages which, as we have just seen, prove the Son to be one with the Father; and it is opposed most distinctly to such passages as teach that there is no God but the One Supreme Creator of the Universe. For example, we read, *Isai. xliv. 8*, 'Is there a God beside Me? Yea, there is no God, I know not any;' and, *Isai. xlv. 5*, 'I am the Lord, there is none else; there is no God beside Me.' (So *Deut. iv. 35, 39*; *xxxii. 38*. *2 Sam. xxii. 32*.) Now, if the Arian hypothesis be true, there is another God, besides God the Father, even His Son Jesus Christ, who is not only another, but an inferior God to the Father. The only way, then, in which we can reconcile the two apparently contradictory truths, (1) that God is one, and (2) that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are each said to be God, is by admitting, as the Scrip-

tures also teach us, that ‘they are not three Gods, but One God’.¹

Thus far then we have proved—I. The Unity of the Godhead—II. That the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God—III. That these two truths are not direct contradictions to each other; for that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are but One God, not three Gods.

But if this were all that we could learn from Scripture, we might naturally conclude that the Sabellian was the correct hypothesis, and that the names of Father, Son, and Spirit were the names but of different modes, operations, or characters of the Deity: so that, perhaps, God might be called Father, when viewed as Creator and Governor; Son, when viewed as Redeemer and Saviour; Spirit, when considered as Sanctifier and Teacher. Or perhaps we might suppose, that the Son and the Spirit were mere attributes of, or influences from God; as, for instance, the Son, the Logos, might be esteemed but as the Reason of God; the Spirit, as that Divine Influence, by which He teaches the minds, and sanctifies the hearts of His servants.

IV. It is therefore necessary to shew, that there is plain evidence from Scripture that the Father is not the Son, and that neither of them is the Holy Ghost; but that they are plainly distinguished from one another, and distinguished too as Personal Agents, not merely as modes, operations, or attributes.

That there is some kind of distinction, must appear from the fact, that the three, Father, Son, and Spirit, are so frequently mentioned together in the same sentence; especially in the forms of blessing and of baptism. (2 Cor. xiii. 14. Matt. xxviii. 19). This alone might be sufficient to prove, that these

¹ It may be observed that, if this is true, then the doctrine of the *homo-ousion*, the consubstantiality of the Son and the Spirit is proved; for if the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost be but one God, the Son and the Spirit must be of one nature and substance with the Father.

three sacred names were not names merely of different characters assumed by God at various times ; for it seems scarcely reasonable to suppose, that the Apostles prayed for blessing from three characters assumed by God, instead of praying for blessing from the One God to whom all such characters belonged ; nor yet can we well believe, that they should invoke blessing from the attributes of God, or baptize converts into a form of faith not in God alone, but in God, His attributes, and His Influences.

But, in order to establish more clearly the fact that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are distinguished as Personal Agents ; it will be necessary to bring passages from Scripture, in which they are represented to us as acting personal parts, and even in which all Three are represented as acting three distinct parts.

1 The Father and the Son act distinct personal parts, and are therefore distinct Personal Agents.

(1) The Father sends the Son ; whereas no one can be said to send himself.

John v. 36, 37 ; vi. 38, 39. Acts iii. 20. Gal. iv. 4. 1 John iv. 9, &c.

(2) The Son leaves the Father and returns to Him again.
John viii. 42 ; ix. 4 ; xii. 49 ; xvi. 5, 28 ; xvii. 3. 1 John iv. 14.

(3) The Son offers Himself to the Father.
Heb. ix. 14.

(4) The Father loves the Son, and the Son loves the Father.

John iii. 35 ; v. 20 ; xiv. 31 ; xv. 9 ; xvii. 24, 26.

(5) The Son is said to make intercession with the Father.
Heb. vii. 25. 1 John ii. 1. Comp. Heb. ix. 24.

(6) The Son in His human Nature prays to the Father.

Luke xxii. 42 ; xxiii. 34. John xvii.

(7) The Father hears, and speaks to the Son.

John xi. 42. Heb. v. 7. Matt. iii. 17 ; xvii. 5. Luke ix. 35. John xii. 28.

2. The Spirit acts distinct parts from either the Father or the Son.

(1) The Father and the Son both send the Spirit.

John xiv. 16, 26 ; xv. 26 ; xx. 22. Acts ii. 33. Gal. iv. 6.

(2) The Spirit makes intercession with the Father, whereas no one can intercede with Himself.

Rom. viii. 26.

(3) The Son offers Himself to the Father, through the Eternal Spirit.

Heb. ix. 14.

(4) Christ tells His disciples that He must go away from them, and that then the Holy Spirit should come in His place ; that He would go to the Father ; and from the Father send the Comforter.

John xiv. 16, 26 ; xvi. 7.

(5) Christ says that the Holy Spirit should not speak of Himself, but should receive of Christ's, and shew to the Church.

John xvi. 13, 14, 15.

3 We not only have the names of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit joined in blessing, and in the form of baptism, but we are told of a scene in which they all three acted jointly, yet separate parts. At the baptism of Christ, the Son was in the man Christ Jesus, baptized ; the Spirit in the shape of a dove descended on Him ; the Father, out of heaven, pronounced Him, His beloved Son.

All these facts put together sufficiently demonstrate that there is a distinction between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and that a distinction of Personal Agents. Yet still, that we may leave no room for objection, it may, perhaps, appear necessary to consider separately, and more at length, the Personality (i) of the Son, (ii) of the Spirit.

I. The general tone of Scripture so clearly indicates, that God the Son is a Person, that, at first, it might appear that the Arian hypothesis, which makes the Son an inferior God to the Father, was the only one, which could be at all maintained on Scriptural grounds; except, of course, the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity. But as the Sabellian hypothesis is not without its advocates and its arguments, it deserves and requires to be considered.

The view, which Sabellianism takes of the Son of God, is, as has been seen before, twofold. Some Sabellians considered God the Son as *altogether* the same as God the Father, and as having no proper distinction from Him. These were in the early ages, called Patripassians. Whereas some looked on God the Son as but an *Emanation* from the Father, not as a Person distinct, in any sense, from Him. These have been called Emanative Sabellians. Both forms have found advocates in some degree, in later times. Patripassianism has been virtually held by some divines, who, in the main orthodox, have endeavoured too boldly to make the doctrine of the Trinity square exactly with human reason and philosophy. The emanative theory has been adopted, more or less, by some, who are in fact Socinians, to elude the force, or explain the difficulty of such passages as John i. 1.

Now against both these hypotheses, the marked distinction which our Lord makes between Himself and the Father must be carefully noted. For example, (John viii. 17, 18): 'It is

written in your Law that the testimony of two men is true. I am one that bear witness of Myself, and the Father that sent Me beareth witness of Me.' Here is a distinct appeal to two distinct witnesses. As the Jewish Law required the evidence of two men; so here the Lord Jesus appeals to the evidence first of Himself, secondly of His Father. Would this be much unlike equivocation, if the Father and the Son had no personal distinction? Again (John v. 17), our Lord says: 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.' And when the Jews accused Him of blasphemy, for making God His Father, and so claiming equality with God, He does not deny the charge of making Himself equal with God; but still goes on to declare to them, that, notwithstanding His unity of nature with the Father, He, the Son, had a personal subordination to Him. 'The Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He seeth the Father do: for what things soever He doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth Him all things that Himself doeth.' In this passage surely, where the Son claims, as the Jews rightly interpreted Him, to be the true Son of God, and so equal with God; He yet plainly sets forth the doctrine that in His Person, though not in His Nature, He was subordinate to the Father; receiving of the Father, and doing the same things as the Father doeth. And so He goes on, 'As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom He will. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son.' Again, 'As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself:' that is, 'the Father,' unlike any creature, is self-existent, having 'life in Himself,' and so He hath given to the Son to be self-existent, and to 'have life in Himself,'—(language clearly spoken of the eternal Son, not merely of the Man Christ Jesus).—'And hath given Him authority to execute judgment also; because He is the

Son of man,' i. e. because He is, not only Son of God, but Son of man also, incarnate, and so the fitter agent to execute the wrath as well as to shew the mercy of God. But again, our Lord goes on, 'I can of Mine own Self do nothing: as I hear I judge: and My judgment is just: because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father, which hath sent me'.¹ Again, in the forty-third verse, 'I am come in My Father's Name, and ye receive Me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive.'

The whole of this passage is one in which our Lord clearly spoke of Himself in His Divine nature, and of His relation to His Father in that nature, which He had in common with Him; yet no language can more expressly mark a distinction of personal action, and personal attribute.

Again, some of the passages which seem to have as their special object to set forth the glory of the Divine Being of the Son, are so worded as specially to shew His distinction of Person from the Father. Thus in Coloss. i. 15, 16, where creation and providence are ascribed to Him in terms of peculiar grandeur, He is called 'the Image of the Invisible God, the First Born of' or 'Begotten before, every creature.' Here He is both represented as the *Image* of the Father, and as having before all creation been *begotten* as His *Son*; both expressions markedly denoting personal difference.

The same thing is even more remarkable in the beginning of the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is plain from the language of the whole of the first chapter, that the subject is the Divine nature of the Son. Yet nothing can be more clear than the distinction which is made between the Father and the Son. First of all, God is said to have spoken in old times by the *prophets*, but in the latter days by His *Son*, 'whom he hath appointed *heir* of all things, by whom also He made the worlds.

¹ See John v. 17—30.

Who being the brightness (the shining forth) of His glory, and the *express Image* of His *Person*, and upholding all things by the word of His power, when He had by Himself purged our sins, sat down on the right Hand of the Majesty on High' (vv. 1, 2, 3). Now here God is said to have spoken by His Son, as He did by the prophets; He is said to have appointed Him heir of all things; (both marking distinctions of Person); then the Son is said to be 'the *express Image* of the Person' of the Father. It may be a question what is meant by the word ὑπόστασις, translated *Person*; but there can be no question that the word χαρακτήρ translated *express Image*, means that the ὑπόστασις of the Son answers to that of the Father, as the impression on wax, answers to the seal which made the impression. Whether then ὑπόστασις means '*Person*' or whether it means '*Mode of existence*,' we learn that as the Son is the shining forth of the Father's glory, so His Person, or His mode of being, corresponds to that of the Father (not only as a Son's to a Father's), but as an impression on wax to the engraving on a seal. This indeed teaches us clearly that the Son is of one glory, and so of one eternal essence with the Father; but as the image on the wax is distinct from that upon the seal, so must there be a distinction between the Father and the Son, of which the distinction of the seal and the wax is a figure and similitude.

The prayer of Our Lord to His Father, in the seventeenth chapter of St. John, is another striking proof, that the Son is indeed of one nature and substance, but not of one Person with the Father. No one can attentively peruse that prayer without seeing that our Lord speaks of Himself and His glory, as the Eternal Son, not merely as the Man Christ Jesus; so that whatever diversity we observe, is not incident merely to our Lord's incarnation, but is also characteristic of Him in His uncreated nature. When therefore He says (ver. 1), 'Father, glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son also may glorify Thee;' we may

inquire what sense the passage could bear, if the Father and the Son were personally identical? Again, the same question is suggested by the following: 'And now, O Father, glorify Thou Me with Thine own self with the glory that I had with Thee before the world was' (ver. 5). And 'I have given unto them the words which Thou gavest Me, and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from Thee, and they have believed that Thou didst send Me' (ver. 8). And again, 'Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world' (ver. 24). Does not all this necessarily prove that, before the world was created, the Person of the Son was different from the Person of the Father?

Perhaps the passage, which most favours the Sabellian notions concerning the Person of the Son, is the important first chapter of St. John. That passage indeed distinctly asserts the *Divinity* of the Son, but language is used, which may be supposed to mean that He is, as regards His Divine nature, not to be distinguished from the Father, or at least to be distinguished only as an emanation or attribute. Plato had used the term *Λόγος*; but he did not probably intend to distinguish, by any *personal* distinction, the *Λόγος* from God. The early heretics had mixed up the philosophy of Plato with the religion of Christ; and they used of the Son of God, the language which the Platonists had used of the *Λόγος*. When therefore St. John came to use the same expression (adopted, as some think, on purpose to refute heretical teachers whilst using their own terms), it might be supposed that, by the *Λόγος*, he meant no more than the *Thought* or *Reason* of God, which, whilst it remained in the bosom of God, was the *Λόγος ἐνδιάθετος*, the *inward Reason* or *Thought*; when it was exerted to create the world or reveal the will of God, it became the *Λόγος προφορικὸς* or, as it were, the *outward Speech* of God.

This view of the passage may seem supported by the eighth chapter of Proverbs, where the Wisdom of God is spoken of in

terms so like St. John's language concerning the Logos, that the fathers, and many after them, have considered that Solomon must there have been writing of Christ. If this be the meaning of the Logos in St. John, we may paraphrase his words somewhat as follows. In the beginning was the Reason or Wisdom of God. That Wisdom was in God, nay, it was God, (for as God is Love, so God is Wisdom). All things were made by the Reason or Wisdom of God, and without it was nothing made that was made It was the true light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world And this wisdom was incarnate or manifested in Christ, and so dwelt among us.

I have endeavoured to put this argument in its strongest form, that I may give it all the weight which it deserves. I proceed to shew wherein it is defective and unsound.

In the first place, the later Platonists, and still more, the Platonizing and Gnostic heretics, had a very different and much more personal notion of the Logos than Plato himself. Again, the Gnostics, against whose opinions in all probability St. John directs many of his statements, considered the Pleroma or fulness of God, to be made up of many Æons or Emanations from God, to which they gave the various names of Nus, Sophia, Dynamis, &c. The chief of these was the Logos, whom they believed to have descended on the man Jesus. It is probable, that in the first chapter of his Gospel, St. John uses the names of other Æons besides the Logos. For example, whereas he first calls the Son of God the Logos; he also tells us that in Him was Zoe (life), and the Zoe was the Phos (light): by which he has been supposed to mean, that the Logos, the Zoe, the Phos, were not different Æons, but that, as St. Paul informed the Colossians (ii. 9), the whole Pleroma of Godhead dwelt in Christ, bodily. Again, St. John tells us that by the Logos, who is also the Phos and the Zoe, the world was created. The Gnostics taught that the world was created by a fallen Æon, who was an enemy to God, and that the Logos came down to destroy

his dominion among men. But St. John teaches that the Logos was Himself the Creator of the Universe, and that without Him nothing was made that was made. Once more, he explains (ver. 14), that the Logos was really made flesh and dwelt among us. The Gnostics did not believe the Logos to be really made flesh, but they supposed either that He only assumed the *appearance* of humanity, or that He descended, for a time, on the man Jesus, and then left him at his crucifixion. Therefore St. John uses the strong expression ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, 'The Word was *made flesh*.' Lastly, he says that 'we beheld His glory, the glory of the *Monogenes* (the Only-begotten) of the Father; full of grace and truth.' *Monogenes* (only-begotten) was the name of another Æon in the Gnostic Pleroma. St. John therefore adds to the other titles of the Son this title of *Monogenes*, to shew still farther, that the Lord Jesus, the Son of the Father, combined in His own Person all the attributes which the Gnostics assigned to these various Æons, and was therefore not simply a single emanation from God, but, as St. Paul says, had in Him a fulness of Deity, and was moreover the Creator of the universe, and not, as the Gnostics had it, one who was sent to overthrow the power of the Creator.

Now, if this be the true explanation of St. John's language, it is vastly unlike the language assigned to him by the Sabellian hypothesis. For whilst St. John is ascribing to the Son supreme Divinity, He does so in a manner which essentially implies Personality too.

But there are many other reasons why the word *Logos*, in the first Chapter of St. John, must be interpreted of a Person, not of an attribute, or quality, like Reason, or Wisdom.

(1) The Word is said to be God. It is not said that the Word is θεῖος, *divine*, but Θεός, *God*. Now it may be possible improperly to say 'God is wisdom,' as the Apostle says, 'God is love.' But we cannot say 'God's wisdom is God,' any more than 'Man's wisdom or reason is man.'

(2) The Word is said to be 'with God,' not *in* God; which implies personality. God's *wisdom* is *in* Him, not, properly speaking, *with* Him.

(3) In ver. 11, the Word is said to have 'come to His own;' meaning, no doubt, His own creatures; which again is personal.

(4) In verse 14, He is called the *Μονογενής*, the *Only-begotten*. But the idea of Sonship is personal. We cannot conceive of the *Son* of God, but as one in some personal sense distinct from Him; just as the term *son* among men indicates one distinct from his father. And, no doubt, as the term *Logos* is used to indicate that the Son from all eternity dwelt in the bosom of the Father, as the reason or wisdom dwells in the bosom of one endowed with such faculties; so the word *Son* is used to indicate to our finite understandings, that, notwithstanding such an intimate union, yet there is a distinction, such, in some degree, as the distinction of father and son.

(5) He is said to have been 'made flesh, and to have dwelt among us;' and that, in opposition to the fancy of the Gnostics or Docetæ, that the Christ or *Logos* took only a *phantastic* body. Accordingly, in Rev. xix. 13, St. John sees a vision of a Person, who is evidently Jesus Christ, and whose name, written on His thigh, is, King of kings, and Lord of lords; and he tells us that this *Person* is called, 'The Word of God.'

(6) In the eighth verse, John the Baptist is contrasted with Him, and declared *not* to be the Light or the *Logos*. Now John the Baptist was undoubtedly a *person*. We must therefore conclude that He, with whom he is contrasted, and of whom the Evangelist had been speaking before, was a *Person* also.

Thus, I trust, we may conclude that the testimony borne by St. John, in the first chapter of his Gospel, is a testimony to the doctrine of the distinct personality of the Son, not to Sabel-

lianism¹. And with this we may venture to leave the question of the Personality of God the Son.

II. We have next to shew the Personality of the Spirit of God.

Now, as we are baptized 'in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;' as the Apostles bless in the name of Jesus Christ, God the Father, and the Holy Ghost: and as on many occasions the Holy Spirit is joined with the Father and the Son, we cannot but think it probable, at least, that as the Father is a Person, and the Son has just been shewn to be a Person distinct from the Father, so the Holy Ghost is a Person also distinct from either of them.

But beyond this we find distinctly that, in Holy Scripture, personal actions are ascribed to the Holy Ghost.

(1) He makes intercession with God the Father, Rom. viii. 26. Now to make intercession is a personal act.

(2) He testifies. John xv. 26.

(3) He teaches. John xiv. 26.

(4) He hears and speaks. John xvi. 13.

(5) He gives spiritual gifts, dividing them according to His will. 1 Cor. xiii. 8, 11.

(6) He inhabits a temple, 1 Cor. iii. 16; vi. 19. This is the act of a Person, not of an attribute or influence.

(7) He is represented not only as speaking generally, but we have speeches set down in Scripture, which the Holy Spirit is said to have uttered to particular persons, *e. g.* Acts x. 20: 'The Spirit said unto Peter, Behold, three men seek thee I have sent them.' Acts xiii. 2: 'The Holy Spirit said,

¹ On this subject, see Waterland's first Sermon at Lady Moyer's Lecture, on John i. 1, Vol. II. p. 1.

Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.'

(8) • He is put in direct opposition to evil spirits, who are doubtless *persons*. 1 Sam. xvi. 14. 2 Chron. xviii. 20, 21.

It has, however, been argued that these and similar personal actions, when ascribed to the Spirit, are the actions of the Father, who, when He does them Himself, is said to do them by His Spirit. In answer to this it can plainly be shewn, that there are many personal actions ascribed to the Spirit, which cannot be ascribed to the Father. For instance, in Rom. viii. 26, as we have just seen, the Spirit intercedes with the Father for the saints. But it cannot be said that the Father intercedes with Himself. Here then we have an instance of the performance of a personal action by the Spirit, which cannot be performed by the Father. Again, Christ is said to send the Spirit (John xvi. 7). But it is never said of God the Father, that He is sent. He sends both the Son and the Spirit, but is never sent Himself. Moreover, (in John xv. 26), our Lord promises 'to send the Spirit from the Father.' If the Spirit means here the Father, then Christ must send the Father from the Father¹. Again, (in chapter xvi. 13, 14), when our Lord promises to send the Paraclete, He says that, 'He,' the Paraclete, 'shall not speak of Himself, but whatsoever He shall hear that shall He speak.' 'He shall glorify Me; for He shall receive of Mine, and shall shew it unto you.' Now it certainly cannot be said of God the Father (from whom eternally both Son and Spirit are derived) that He should not speak of Himself, but should speak what He heard only. Nothing which implies *subordination* is ever spoken of God the Father. We conclude, therefore, that the Spirit (who is here represented as acting personal parts, and parts which cannot belong to the Person of the Father) is both a Person, and a Person distinct from the Father.

¹ See Hey, Vol. II. p. 443.

The fact that the Spirit is called *Paraclete*, which means either *Comforter* or, more probably, *Advocate*¹, seems to imply distinct personality.

The use of the masculine pronoun *He*, ἐκεῖνος, to designate the Holy Ghost, surely indicates that reference is made to a personal Agent, not to an influence or attribute. This is observable especially in John xvi. 13, where we have in immediate connexion, ‘When He the Spirit of truth is come,’ ἐκεῖνος, τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, a masculine pronoun, whilst τὸ Πνεῦμα is neuter².

From these, then, and similar reasons, we conclude, that the Spirit is a distinct Person from the Father and the Son.

Thus we have reached the conclusion of our reasoning on the subject of Personality, and so we believe our Fourth Proposition to be established: that although the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are but one God, yet are they clearly distinguished from One another, and distinguished as Personal Agents.

Now this is the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity, as held by the Catholic fathers, expressed in the Creeds of the Church, and exhibited in this first Article of the Reformed Church of England, viz. that ‘There is but one God,’ yet that ‘in the Unity of that Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.’

This conclusion we deduce from the statements of Scripture. We do not pretend to explain the mystery, for it is, of course, above the reach of finite understanding. Yet we cannot doubt that, in the substance of it at least, our conclusions are legitimate. To explain the subject philosophically, would be inconsistent with the purpose in hand, inconsistent with the assertion

¹ See Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. viii. p. 329, Note, fol.; and Suicer, s. v. Παράκλητος.

² The Personality of the Holy Ghost is fully and admirably treated by Bp. Pearson, Art. viii. p. 308, fol.

that it is a mystery (that is, a thing which human reason cannot fathom), and therefore impossible. It may not even be altogether possible to mark out accurately the exact distinctions between Tritheism and Trinitarianism on the one hand, between Trinitarianism and Sabellianism on the other. This, by the way, should make us not the less earnest to maintain the truth, nay the more earnest, because of the greater danger of error; but yet the more tender, the more ready in meekness to instruct those who from the difficulty of apprehending have been led to doubt this great article of the faith. But though all this is true, yet thoughtfully considered, this doctrine of the Trinity, though above our understanding, does not necessarily appear contrary to our reason. That reason may well teach us that, it is likely God should subsist, in a manner above what we can apprehend. That reason may teach us that, though God's nature is infinite, and therefore cannot be multiplied; yet seeing that He has shewn Himself to be essentially loving, and loving to have partakers of His love, it is not impossible that there might exist, even in the divine Essence, something like a Personal diversity, that so He, who, as regards the creature, dwells in light which is unapproachable, might have within Himself that which would be capable of receiving and imparting the love which can be perfect in God alone. Yet such a diversity existing in the Godhead, which from its very perfection can admit neither multiplication nor division, could not constitute a distinction of Deity, though it would constitute what, in the language of Theology, has been called a distinct Personality.

The Fathers, who used the language which has been inserted in the Creeds and generally adopted in the Church, never thought, when they used to speak of three Persons in one God, of speaking of such three Persons as they would speak of *persons* and *personality* among created beings. They did not consider, for example, the Persons of the Father and the Son,

as they would have done the persons of Abraham and Isaac—the Persons of the Holy Trinity, as they would have done the persons of Peter, Paul, and John, which are separate from one another, and do not in any way depend on each other for their essence. They held that the Father was the Head and Fountain of Deity (Πηγὴ Θεότητος), from whom the Son and Holy Spirit are from all eternity derived, but so derived, as not to be divided from the Father; but they are in the Father and the Father in them, by a certain *περιχώρησις* or *inhabitation*. So then, though they acknowledged the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost to be really three Persons, yet they held ‘them to have no divided or separate existence, as three different men have, but to be intimately united and conjoined one to another, and to exist in each other, and by the said ineffable *περιχώρησις* or *inhabitation* to pervade or permeate one another¹.’

¹ Bull, *Posth. Works*, p. 1004, quoted by Waterland, *Works*, Vol. II. p. 211. Patrem, Filium et Spiritum Sanctum, cum revera tres sint Personæ nequaquam tamen ut tres homines seorsum et separatim existere, sed intime sibi invicem cohærere et conjunctos esse; adeoque alterum in altero existere, atque, ut ita loquar, immeare invicem et penetrare per ineffabilem quandam *περιχώρησιν*, quam *circuminsessionem* scolastici vocant.—Bull, *Def. Fid. Nic.* II. 9, 23; *Works*, Vol. IV. p. 363; see also § IV. Lib. IV.; also Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. II. p. 138, fol.

On the meaning of the word *Person*, see Waterland, *Works*, Vol. III. p. 338. Athanasius, Dial. I. *De S. Trinitate*, Tom. II. p. 173, gives the following definition of ὑπόστασις. ‘Ἡ ὑπόστασις ιδιότητα ἔχει, ἥτις οὐκ ἔστι κοινὴ τῶν τῆς αὐτῆς οὐσίας ὑποστασέων. In this passage ὑπόστασις means *person*.

The term, by which to designate what we call *person*, was early a subject of dispute. The Greeks mostly used the word ὑπόστασις, the Latins *Persona*. Yet among the Greeks it was not uniformly agreed to speak of τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις and μία Οὐσία. Some, on the contrary, identified ὑπόστασις with οὐσία, and spoke of μία ὑπόστασις. These differences in language led to the Council of Alexandria, A.D. 362, at which Athanasius was present, and at which this *λογομαχία* was condemned.

See Athanasius, Dial. II. Tom. II. p. 159; Suicer, s. v. ὑπόστασις, and Newman’s *Hist. of Arians*, ch. v. § 2.

ARTICLE II.

*That the Word or Son of God was
made very man.*

THE Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, and of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man; who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.

*Verbum Dei verum hominem esse
factum.*

FILIUS, qui est Verbum Patris, ab æterno a Patre genitus, verus et æternus Deus, ac Patri consubstantialis, in utero beatæ Virginis, ex illius substantia naturam humanam assumpsit: ita ut duæ naturæ, divina et humana, integre atque perfecte in unitate personæ fuerint inseparabiliter conjunctæ: ex quibus est unus Christus, verus Deus, et verus homo, qui vere passus est, crucifixus, mortuus, et sepultus, ut Patrem nobis reconciliaret, essetque hostia, non tantum pro culpa originis, verum etiam pro actualibus hominum peccatis.

SECTION I.

HISTORY.

THIS Article evidently treats of three distinct points. I. The Divine nature of the Son of God; II. His incarnation; III. His sufferings, sacrifice, and propitiation.

I. First, as regards the Divine nature of the Son of God; as it was shewn under the first Article, that he was of one substance and co-eternal with the Father; so the history of the different opinions concerning His consubstantiality and co-eternity formed part of the history of that Article. It is not necessary to repeat either those arguments or that history here.

I shall consider that I have said enough concerning the Divine nature of our blessed Lord, when, in addition to His consubstantiality and co-eternity before treated of, I have spoken concerning His generation from the Father, whereby He is the Begotten or Only-begotten Son of God.

It has already been shewn that the Arians and Eunomians held that the Son might be called *μονογενής*, not as being the only-begotten of the Father, by a true and proper generation, but as having been begotten or created by the Father alone¹; and the Socinians have endeavoured to explain the word, as though it meant no more than *beloved*, as Isaac was called the *only son* of Abraham, though Ishmael was his son also.

It is hardly necessary to observe, that the orthodox fathers held that the Son was begotten of the Father from all eternity, so before all time deriving His Divine Essence from His Father (*μόνος ἐκ μόνου γεγέννηται τοῦ Πατρὸς*. Cyril. Alexandr. in *Act. Concil. Ephes.*) This eternal generation they held to be a proof that He was of one substance and eternity with the Father; but the relation of Father to Son they held to constitute a priority of *order*, though not of *nature* or *power*. They held, that is, not that the Son was, in His nature as God, in any degree different from, or inferior to the Father; but that, as the Father alone was the source and fountain (*πηγὴ, ἀρχή, αἰτία*) of Deity, the Son having been begotten, and the Spirit proceeding; so there was a subordination, without diversity, of the Son to the Father, and of the Spirit to the Father and the Son². It may be difficult to conceive of priority of order, without being led to believe in superiority of nature. This

¹ Οἱ Ἀρείανοι λέγουσιν, ὅτι μονογενής λέγεται, διότι αὐτὸς μόνος γέγονε καὶ ἐκτίσθη ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, τὰ δ' ἄλλα πάντα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.—Theoph. in Joh. cap. iii. See Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 138; Suicer, π. p. 375.

² The statements of the Ante-Nicene fathers on this subject are fully investigated by Bp. Bull, *F. D.* Sect. iv. *De Subordinatione Filii*. See also Suicer, s. vv. αἰτία, ἀρχή, πηγὴ.

seems to have been the cause why Dr. Clarke and other high Arians, perceiving the truth of the doctrine, that there was a certain priority of order among the Persons of the undivided Trinity, and unable to distinguish between priority of order and superiority of nature, were led into an assertion of the heretical doctrine of the inferiority of the nature of the Son.

II. The second part of the Article contains the doctrine of the Incarnation.

Errors upon this doctrine were held by the Gnostics, or *Docetæ*, and the Manichees, who taught that our Lord's Body was but a phantom, and that He came not in the flesh, but in appearance only (*οὐκ ἐν σαρκί, ἀλλὰ δοκῆσει*); by those heretics, who denied the Divinity of our Lord, and therefore, of course, the union of the two natures in one Person; and in short by all the Oriental and Judaizing sects. But the most important controversies on this mystery arose from the errors of, 1 the Arians and Apollinarians, 2 the Nestorians, 3 the Eutychians, 4 the Monothelites.

1 Arius taught that the Son of God did not take human nature, but a human body only, and that the Divine Word was in the place of the soul¹.

Apollinarius, who maintained against Arius the consubstantiality of the Son, agreed with him in a great measure concerning the mode of His incarnation, teaching that our Lord took a human body and a sensitive or *animal* soul, but that the place of the *rational* soul was supplied by God the Word, thus distinguishing, according to a common notion of those times, between the *νοῦς*, or mens, and the *ψυχὴ*, or anima².

¹ See Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 160. In eo autem quod Christum sine anima solam carnem suscepisse arbitrantur minus noti sunt sed hoc verum esse et Epiphanius non tacuit, et ego ex eorum quibusdam scriptis et colloctionibus certissime comperi.—Augustin. *Hæres.* 49. Tom. viii. p. 18.

² Pearson, as above. Mosheim, Cent. iv. Pt. ii. ch v. § 17. Apolli-

2 The Nestorian controversy arose as follows. The Greek fathers, justly esteeming that our Lord, from the moment that He was conceived in the womb of His mother, was not only man but God also, and maintaining that the union between His two natures was so perfect, that it was right for example to say ‘God suffered,’ went so far as to call the Virgin Mary by the title Θεοτόκος, or *Deipara*. Nestorius declaimed strongly against this title, as indicating, according to his view of the subject, that God was liable to change, whereas God can neither be born nor die. He held that the *Man* Christ Jesus only could derive His birth from His earthly parent, and that therefore the Virgin might be called Χριστοτόκος, but not Θεοτόκος. These statements were considered to involve a denial of the union of the two natures of God and man in the one Person of Christ¹. Nestorius was accused of teaching, that there were not only two natures, but two persons in Christ, viz. the Person of God the Son, and the Person of the man Christ Jesus. For this doctrine (though he appears to have denied the inferences drawn from his statements) he was condemned in the council of Ephesus, A. D. 431, summoned by Theodosius the younger, and at which Cyril of Alexandria presided. This council determined that the true doctrine was, that ‘Christ was but one Person, in whom two natures are intimately united, but not confounded.’

The tenets of the Nestorians, however, spread rapidly and widely in the East. They were embraced by the school of Edessa, were eagerly propagated by Barsumas, who became Bishop of Nisibis in 435; and by his influence took such root

naristas Apollinaris instituit, qui de anima Christi a Catholicis dissenserunt, dicentes, sicut Ariani, Deum Christum carnem sine anima suscepisse. In qua quæstione testimoniis Evangelicis victi, mentem, qua rationalis est anima hominis, defuisse animæ Christi, sed pro hac ipsum Verbum in eo fuisse dixerunt.—Augustin. *Hæres.* 55, Tom. viii. p. 19.

¹ The technical term for this union was the *ἐνωσις καθ’ ὑπόστασιν*—Hypostatic union.

in Persia, that the patriarchal see of Seleucia was filled by a Nestorian; to whose authority, even to modern times, the Nestorian churches have been subjected. Nestorianism extended into India, Armenia, Arabia, Syria, and Egypt¹. A most interesting portion of this sect at present is to be found in the mountains of Kurdistan, though it has been almost exterminated by the cruelty of the Kurds².

3 Eutyches, an abbot at Constantinople, from opposition to Nestorianism, was led into the other extreme. He asserted that the Divine and human natures of Christ were originally distinct, but that after their union, they became but one nature, the human nature being transubstantiated into the Divine. Before the hypostatic union, he acknowledged two natures; but after that union he acknowledged but one. The council of Chalcedon, which was summoned by Marcian in 451, and is reckoned the fourth general Council, condemned Eutyches, and declared the Catholic doctrine to be, that ‘In Christ two distinct natures are united in one Person, without any change, mixture, or confusion³.’

The Eutychian, or Monophysite doctrine, notwithstanding this condemnation, rapidly gained ground, principally through the zeal of Jacob Baradæus, bishop of Edessa, from whom the sect of the Eutychians are called Jacobites. It was established in Syria, Mesopotamia, Armenia, Egypt, Abyssinia. The Eutychians became united under the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria, and so continue to this day. They are now divided into three principal societies; the Oriental Monophysites subject to the patriarch of Antioch; the African Monophysites subject to the patriarch of Alexandria, embracing the Copts and Abyssinians; and thirdly, the Armenians, who, though agreeing with the other Monophysites concerning the natures of Christ, are

¹ Suicer, s. v. Θεοτόκος and Χριστοτόκος.—Pearson, *On the Creed*, pp. 178 and 163; Mosheim, Cent. v. Pt. II. ch. v.

² See Dr Grant's *Nestorians*; and Layard's *Nineveh*, Vol. I. ch. 7, 8.

³ Suicer, s. v. ἀκέφαλοι; Pearson, p. 162; Mosheim, Cent. v. Pt. II. ch. v.

not united with them in other points of faith and discipline, and are subject to patriarchs of their own¹.

4 In the seventh century a new controversy on this important subject arose; and a more subtle question was mooted. This question was, whether in Christ there were two distinct *wills*, the Divine and the human, or but one, the Divine. Those, who adopted the opinion that there was but one will in Christ, among whom was Honorius, bishop of Rome, were called Monothelites, and were condemned in 680 by the sixth general Council, the second Constantinopolitan. Their doctrine was supposed to border too closely on that of the Monophysites. It appears, however, that they entirely disclaimed Monophysite errors; and from the ambiguous manner in which their views were expressed, it has been questioned whether they held that the human will in Christ was wholly swallowed up in the Divine will, or only that it was so completely subservient to the Divine will, as always to move in unison with it².

III. As to the third division of this Article, the terms of it probably had reference to the error of the Docetæ, who denied that our Lord '*truly*' suffered, teaching either that He suffered only in appearance, or, as Basilides would have it, that Simon the Cyrenian was crucified in His place.

Of course, it may be added that the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ is necessarily denied by all humanitarian heretics, and others, who nearly symbolize with them. The Swedenborgians also of late times, though in some sense admitting the Atonement, appear to deny any thing of the nature of a vicarious sacrifice, maintaining that redemption consists in the subduing of the powers of evil within the Christian, by virtue of union with the Redeemer in His human nature.

¹ Mosheim, Cent. iv. Pt. II. ch. v. Cent. xvi. § 3, Pt. I.

² Mosheim, Cent. vii. Pt. II. ch. v.

SECTION II.

SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

I. **T**HE division of the subjects treated of in this Article, which has been suggested above, leads us to consider in the first place the eternal generation of the Son of God.

That the nature and being of the Son were from all eternity, and that He was of one substance with the Father, having been shewn in the First Article, it is only necessary to prove here that that nature, though eternal, is yet derived from the Father, in such a manner that the relationship of the Father to the Son is best expressed to our understandings by the term, and under the notion of generation.

In order to represent to us the mode of existence of the Second Person in the Trinity, and His relation to the First, Holy Scripture has used various terms, drawn from human relations. The most common and important are the terms 'Word' and 'Son.' The term 'Word' or 'Logos,' is probably used, to exhibit the intimate connexion of the one Person with the other; that as reason dwells in man, so the Logos dwells in God, and that, as the word goeth forth from the heart and lips of man, so the Word is sent forth from God the Father.

In like manner, we must conceive the term 'Son' to indicate something definite concerning the relation of the Son to the Father; the variety of terms being adopted, probably because no one term could sufficiently convey to our understandings just notions of the nature and of the connexion of the Persons in the Godhead.

That God the Son is not the same Person with God the Father has already been shewn. That he is called the 'Word' and the 'Son' of the Father, seems sufficiently to declare that He derives in some manner His Being from the Father, even

as the word springs from him who thinks and speaks, as the son is derived from him who begets him. This is farther evident from express statements in Holy Scripture. For example, our Lord is distinctly said to be *begotten* of the Father. He is called the Begotten and 'Only-begotten of the Father,' John i. 14. The Psalmist, as explained by St. Paul, tells us that God said to our Saviour, 'Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee,' Ps. ii. 7. Acts xiii. 33. Heb. i. 5. And so He is spoken of as having been 'begotten before every creature.' (Πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, Col. i. 15.)

In correspondence with this notion of Sonship, our Lord is constantly called 'Heir of all things,' and said to be Possessor of all things, by right of Sonship. (See Heb. i. 2, 3, 4 ; iii. 6. John xvi. 15). Again, our Lord speaks of Himself, as deriving His own eternal Being from God the Father¹. 'As the living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father' (John vi. 57), and again, 'As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself' (John v. 26). From which we learn, that the mode of existence which the Father possessed from all eternity, He communicated to the Son. All created beings have their existence from, and their life in God. But the Son, who is uncreated, derives indeed his Being from the Father ; but it is a Being of the same kind as the Father's, and therefore not dependent, like a creature's, but independent, self-existent, having life in itself.

Accordingly the Son is farther called 'the Brightness of His Father's glory, the express Image of His Person,' Heb. i. 3 ; words which in the Greek indicate a relation of the Son to His Father, like that of brightness to light, like that of the impression of a seal on wax to the seal which it answers to².

¹ In John v. 18, our Lord speaks of God as his *true* and *proper* Father, ἀλλὰ καὶ πατέρα ἴδιον ἔλεγε τὸν Θεόν.

² Origen, commenting on these words of the Apostle, *Splendor est gloria Dei*, says: *Deus lux est, secundum Joannem, splendor ergo hujus Lucis*

Now the communication of the nature of God, thus made by the Father to the Son, may be called a proper generation. Nay! it is more proper than any earthly generation. For, in human generation, the son indeed derives his nature from his father, but it is in a manner according with the imperfection of humanity. Man's generation is in time, and, as connected with that which is material, results, in part at least, from that property of matter called divisibility. The son too, in human beings, when derived from the father, becomes separate from him.

But this is not so with God. God's eternal perfections He, from all eternity, communicated to His Son. 'So also the Divine Essence, being by reason of its simplicity not subject to division, and in respect of its infinity incapable of multiplication, is so communicated as not to be multiplied, insomuch that He, which proceedeth by that communication, hath not only the same nature, but is also the same God. The Father God, and the Word God; Abraham man, and Isaac man: but Abraham one man, Isaac another man; not so the Father one God, and the Word another; but the Father and the Word both the same God. Being then the propriety of generation is founded in the essential similitude of the son unto the father, by reason of the same which he receiveth from him; being the full, perfect nature of God is communicated unto the Word, and that more intimately, and with a greater unity or identity than can be found in human generation; it followeth that this communication of the Divine nature is the proper generation by which Christ is, and is called the true and proper Son of God¹.'

est Unigenitus Filius, ex ipso inseparabiliter velut splendor ex luce procedens, et illuminans universam creaturam.—*De Principiis*, Lib. I. ch. II. n. 7.

¹ Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. II. p. 138, fol. So Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* Bk. v. ch. LIV. 2. 'By the gift of eternal generation, Christ hath received of the Father one and in number the self-same substance, which the

This peculiar relation of the Father to the Son is that which has authorized the Church, while she confesses an equality of nature, to admit also a priority of order in the Persons of the Trinity. The Father hath this pre-eminence, that He is not only uncreated, but unbegotten too. He derives His essence from none, being Himself the Fountain of life and the Source of being. The Son too is uncreated, deriving His being, not by creation but by generation, from the Father. Yet in this He is subordinate to the Father; not that His attributes are lower, or His nature inferior, but that both are derived. The Father begat; the Son is begotten. The Father is Life, Christ too is Life; but He confesses that He has life from the Father (John vii. 29), and that 'He liveth by the Father' (John vi. 57). 'The Father hath life in Himself:' so too has the Son. But the Father not only in Himself, but from Himself. The Son in Himself, but from the Father (John v. 26). On this account therefore, and in this sense 'the Father is greater than the Son' (John xiv. 28); greater as regards priority of order, not greater as regards infinity of nature¹.

II. The second part of the Article concerns the true doctrine of the Incarnation of the Son of God. It is thus expressed 'The Son....took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance, so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined

Father hath of Himself unreceived from any other. For every "beginning" (Eph. iii. 15) is a father unto that which cometh of it, and every "offspring" is a son to that out of which it groweth. Seeing therefore that the Father alone is originally that Deity, which Christ originally is not, (for Christ is God by being of God; light by issuing out of light); it followeth hereupon, that whatsoever Christ hath common unto Him with His heavenly Father, the same of necessity must be given Him, but naturally and eternally given; not bestowed by way of benevolence and favour, as the other gifts' (i. e. those of union and of unction) 'both are.'

¹ See Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. i. p. 34; Bull, *F. D.*, § 4.

together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God, and very man.'

1 The wording of this is very important. 'The Son of God took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin.' It appears directly from Holy Scripture that the Being conceived by the Virgin was, from the moment of His conception, the Son of God (Luke i. 35, 43. Matt. i. 20, 23). Had the human nature of our Lord been conceived in the womb of the Virgin, and then united to the Divine nature, it is clear that Christ would have consisted of two distinct persons; one person the Son of God; the other person, that human being who had been conceived of the Virgin Mary. For if a human being had been first conceived of the Virgin, and then united to God, it is clear that that human being must have been a human *person*, previously to the union with the Divine Person; and so the incarnation would have been the union of two persons, not the union of two natures¹. It was from want of attention to this that Nestorius was led into error. He denied that the Person, who was born of the Virgin, was God; and said that He was only man. Hence he was obliged to divide Christ into two persons. 'If,' says Hooker, 'the Son of God had taken to himself a man now made and already perfected, it would of necessity follow that there are in Christ two persons, the one assuming, the other assumed; whereas the Son of God did not assume a man's person to His own, but a man's nature to His own Person; and therefore took *semen*, the seed of Abraham, the very first original element of our nature, before it was come to have any personal human subsistence. The flesh, and the ~~union~~ of the flesh with God, began both at one instant;

¹ illud nos oportet scire, quod aliud est in Christo Deitatis
 et est Unigenitus Filius Patris; et alia humana natura quam in
 temporibus pro dispensatione suscepit.—Origen. *De Principiis*,
 .ii. ii. n. 1.

His making and taking to Him our flesh was but one act, so that in Christ there is no personal subsistence but one, and that from everlasting. By taking only the nature of man, He still continueth one Person, and changeth but the manner of His subsisting, which was before in the mere glory of the Son of God, and is now in the habit of our flesh¹.

Thus it is said by St John, 'The Word was made flesh' (John i. 14); by St Paul, 'Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also took part of the same' (Heb. ii. 14). 'He took not the nature of angels, but He took the seed of Abraham' (Heb. ii. 16). It was 'Emmanuel, God with us,' who was born of the Virgin (Isai. vii. 14. Matt. i. 23); yea, 'the Son of God' (Luke i. 32, 35)².

The fact, thus exhibited, that the Son of God took in the womb of the Virgin the nature of man, explains some of the most remarkable passages in the new Testament. As there is but one Person in Christ, and *that* the Person of the Son of God; it naturally follows that even the actions proper to man will at times be attributed to God, and the actions proper to God will be attributed to the man Jesus³. Thus we understand the Scripture, when it says, that men 'crucified the Lord of

¹ Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* Bk. iv. lxx. 3.

² The Scriptures clearly indicate this to have been the case. See Luke i. 39—44; ii. 11. The former passage is especially clear, shewing that Elisabeth by the Holy Ghost, and even the yet unborn 'prophet of the Highest,' acknowledged the presence of their 'Lord,' when he was yet in the womb of his mother. The earliest fathers speak as plainly on the subject, as if they had foreseen the heresy of Nestorius; *e. g.* ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκνοφορήθη ἀπὸ Μαρίας κατ' οἰκονομίαν Θεοῦ, ἐκ σπέρματος μὲν Δαβὶδ, Πνεύματος δὲ ἁγίου.—Ignat. *ad Ephes.* 18.

³ Cum ergo in eo quædam ita videamus humana ut nihil a communi mortalium fragilitate distare videantur, quædam ita divina, ut nulli alii nisi illi primæ et ineffabili naturæ convenient Deitatis, hæret humana intellectus angustia, et tantæ admirationis stupore percussa quo declinet, quid teneat, quo se convertat, ignorat. Si Deum sentiat, mortalem videt; si hominem putet, devicto mortis imperio cum spoliis redeuntem a mortuis cernit. . . . Nam et Filius Dei mortuus esse dicitur, pro ea scilicet natura

glory' (1 Cor. ii. 8); when it says, that 'God purchased the Church by His own Blood' (Acts xx. 28): because, though God in His Divine Nature, cannot be crucified, and has no blood to shed; yet the Son of God, the Lord of Glory, took into His Person the nature of man, in which nature he could suffer, could shed his Blood, could be crucified, could die. Thus again, we understand the Scripture, when it attributes to a man powers and attributes which belong only to God. Our Lord (John iii. 13) speaks of none having gone up to Heaven 'save the Son of man, who is in Heaven;' yet the Son of man was then on earth. Omnipresence is an attribute of none but God. But the Son of man here spoken of was God, God having taken into His own Person man's nature¹. And so 'as oft as we attribute to God what the manhood of Christ claimeth, or to man what his Deity hath right unto, we understand by the name of God and the name of Man, neither the one or the other *nature*, but the whole *Person* of Christ, in which both natures are².' Of that Person then, we may say, that He reigns as God, that He was subject as man. Of that Person we may say, that He liveth for ever, and yet that He suffered and died. Of that Person we may say, that He 'was crucified through weakness,' and yet that He hath 'the Power of God.' Of that Person we may say, that whilst He was bound down to live on earth, He yet filled heaven with His presence and glory³.

quæ mortem utique recipere poterat: et filius hominis appellatur, qui venturus in Dei Patris gloria cum sanctis angelis prædicatur.—Origen. *de Principiis*, Lib. II. ch. vi. n. 2, 3.

¹ Compare John i. 48.

² Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. LIII. 4.

³ *Επὶ γῆς μὲν γὰρ ὁ Ὑἱὸς καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος βεβήκει, οὐράνου δὲ ἤπτετο, καὶ πάντες ἐχθροὶ ἐπληροῦντο τῆς αὐτοῦ δόξης· καὶ ἐν Μαρίας ἐτύγχανε καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο, ἀλλὰ τῇ δυνάμει αὐτοῦ ἐπλήρου τὰ σύμπαντα.*—Epiphanius. *Hæres.* LXIX. Tom. I. p. 788. Colon.

Hooker does not scruple to say: 'The union of the flesh with Deity is to that flesh a gift of principal grace and favour; for by virtue of this grace, *man is really made God*, a creature is exalted above the dignity of all creatures, and hath all creatures else under it.' And again, 'Since God hath

2 The article having expressed the truth, that the Son of God took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance; adds, 'So that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead, and Manhood, were joined together in one Person.' Having already shewn that there was but one Person with two natures, it is necessary farther to observe, that those two natures continued perfect and entire; for, though the Person was but one, the Person of the eternal Son of God, yet we must not suppose that the verity of either of His natures was lost or absorbed.

1 That He was perfect God, appears by what was proved under the first Article; and indeed His Divine nature could not cease to be Divine by his taking to Him the nature of man; for God is not liable to change or to diminution. And though, by taking human nature, the Son of God was enabled to suffer, which to God simply would have been impossible, yet by taking human nature He did not change the nature of God. And this appears from plain passages of Scripture; for where the Son of God is spoken of as God, it is constantly in those very passages, where He is called by the name of Christ or of Jesus, or of the Son of Man, or is spoken of as incarnate, *e.g.* John i. 14; iii. 13; viii. 58; x. 30. Acts xx. 28. Rom. ix. 5. Phil. ii. 5, 6. Col. i. 14, 15, &c.

2 That He was perfect Man will appear, if we can shew, that He had a human Body and a human Soul, both subject to human infirmities and invested with human attributes.

That he had a human Body appears from His birth of the Virgin (Matt. i. 25. Luke i. 35; ii. 7); from His growth like

deified our nature, though not by turning it into Himself, yet by making it His own inseparable habitation, we cannot now conceive, how God should without man, either exercise Divine power, or receive the glory of Divine praise; for man is in both the associate of Deity.'—*Eccl. Pol.* Bk. LIII. LIV.

other children (Luke ii. 52); from His liability to hunger (Luke iv. 2); to weariness (John iv. 6); to pain (Luke xxii. 44); to bleeding and bloody sweat (John xix. 34. Luke xxii. 44); to wounds and laceration (John xx. 27); from His possessing flesh and bones (Luke xxiv. 39, 40); from His crucifixion, death, burial and resurrection.

That he had a perfect human Soul appears from His 'increasing in wisdom' (Luke ii. 52); from the possibility of His being ignorant (Mark xiii 32), (which could not be true of Him considered only in His Divine nature); from His being liable to temptation (Matt. iv. 1. Heb. iv. 15); from His feeling sorrow and sympathy (Luke xix. 41. John xi. 35. Matt. xxvi. 37, 38, &c.); from the separation of His Soul from His Body at death, the Soul descending to Hades, whilst the Body was laid in the grave (Acts ii. 27, 31).

And as the nature of His Godhead was not changed (God not being capable of change) by union with His manhood; so also the nature of His manhood was not changed by being taken into His Godhead; farther than that it was thereby exalted, ennobled, glorified. For the object of God's taking flesh was, that He might take to Himself a nature like our own, in which He might be tempted with our temptations, liable to our sorrows and infirmities, and subject to our sufferings and death. The properties therefore of His human nature were not sunk nor absorbed in His Divine nature, any more than His Divine nature was altered or corrupted by His human nature.

3 That these two natures, thus united in the one Person of Christ, shall 'never be divided,' appears from the nature of the union, the object of that union, and the declaration of Scripture¹. The nature of the union being that the Person of

¹ One of the errors of the Photinians was that they believed the kingdom of Christ would wholly cease at the end of the world, and that the Word would be wholly resolved into the Father, and as a separate Person cease to exist. See Pearson, Art. vi. p. 204, note. The only text which

the Eternal Son took to Himself a human *nature*, not a human *person*, it follows that if the two natures were divided at any time, either a new person would be brought into being, or else the human nature of Christ would utterly cease to exist. According to the latter supposition, instead of being highly exalted and set above all His fellows, Christ's human Body and Soul would be annihilated and perish. Surely neither of these hypotheses is tenable. Again the end and purpose of the union, whereby the Son of God took the nature of man, being that He might join together God and men, Himself both God and man, and the necessity of such conjunction never ceasing, it follows that the union of the natures shall never cease. It is through the instrumentality of Christ's humanity that man is united to God. When the union has been effected we cannot suppose that the bond will be destroyed, the link annihilated. It is by virtue of incorporation into Christ's Body that the saints shall rise and reign : and we cannot suppose that Christ's

can appear even for a moment to favour the notion that Christ shall ever cease to be both perfect God and perfect Man, is the remarkable passage 1 Cor. xv. 24, 28, where it is said that Christ shall deliver up the kingdom to the Father, and 'the Son Himself shall be subject to Him that did put all things under Him, that God may be all in all.' We cannot, however, from this infer that the Son of God shall leave His human nature and be absorbed into the Person of the Father, and that then the human nature of Christ divested of the Divine shall be subject to God : for, if no other passage in Scripture opposed that notion, this very passage would of itself refute it. It is the *Son* who is to be subject to the Father, but the human nature of Christ, separated (if that were possible) from His Divine nature, would not be the Son of God. The true interpretation of the passage is, that the Son, who, in His human nature and touching His manhood, is inferior to the Father, yet now seated on the throne of His mediatorial kingdom, reigns supreme over men, angels, and devils. But at the end, when the need of that mediatorial reign has passed away, then the mediatorial sceptre shall be laid down, Christ shall reign with God upon his right hand ; but as *κατ' οἰκονομίαν*, and in His human nature, He is inferior to the Father, so then He shall be subject to the Father ; God shall be all in all.—See Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. vi. p. 283.

Body shall cease to be one with the Son of God, when the saints incorporated into It, reign because of It.

And this farther appears from Scripture ; where we read that ‘ Christ *ever* liveth to make intercession for us’ (Heb. vii. 25) ; that ‘ He is a Priest *for ever*’ (Heb. vi. 20 ; vii. 21, 24), ‘ consecrated for *evermore*’ (Heb. vii. 28) ; that ‘ He is set down at the right hand of God *for ever*’ (Heb. x. 12) ; that ‘ His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and that He shall reign for ever and ever’ (Dan. ii. 44 ; vii. 14, 18, 27. Luke i. 32, 33. Rev. xi. 15).

III. The Article, thirdly, asserts that the Son of God, having thus taken man’s nature, ‘ truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.’

To enter at full length into each portion of this clause of the Article, would necessarily exceed our present limits. The student may be referred to the Fourth Article of Pearson, *On the Creed*, for a most able exposition of the doctrine of Scripture concerning our Lord’s sufferings, crucifixion, death and burial.

1 To shew the *reality* of our Lord’s sufferings and death, it is only necessary to read the last chapters of the four Gospels, which require no comment. If they did, such comment would be found in the prophecies of Christ’s sufferings (*e.g.* Ps. xxii. Isai. liii.) ; and in the letters and discourses of the Apostles on them (*e.g.* Acts ii. 22, 23 ; iii. 15 ; x. 39 ; xiii. 29. Rom. v. 10 ; vi. 8 ; 1 Cor. xv. 16 ; 2 Cor. 1. 5 ; iv. 10. Phil. ii. 8. Heb. ii. 9, 10 ; v. 7, 8 ; ix. 17—28 ; x. 10 ; xii. 2 ; xiii. 12. 1 Pet. ii. 21 ; iii. 18). The reality of the death indeed is a subject immediately connected with the reality of the human nature of Christ. The Docetæ, who denied the one, naturally and necessarily denied the other. It was against them that St. John appears to have written many passages both in his

Gospel and Epistles, as for example, John xix. 34, 35. 1 John iv. 3 ; v. 6. 2 John 7. Errors against which the words of Scripture are specially directed, cannot lightly be disregarded by the Church. But as such errors are not likely to prevail extensively now, it may be unnecessary to dwell at length upon their refutation.

2 One subject connected with the death and sufferings of our Saviour requires to be a little further considered. The Son of God by taking on Him human nature, became truly man ; and one of the chief ends of His thus becoming man, was that He might die. But it may be asked still, Wherein did His death consist, and how did He suffer ? Man dies, when his soul leaves his body. Man suffers, because his whole nature is passible. But Jesus Christ was man ; yet not mere man. His Person consisted of the eternal Son united to a human Body and a human Soul. How then did He suffer, and how die ?

He suffered in His human nature, which being a perfect human nature, was capable of suffering both in Soul and Body. We may not imagine, as has already been shewn, that His human nature ceased to be human nature, when it was taken by his Godhead ; ‘that the properties of the weaker nature have vanished with the presence of the more glorious, and have been therein swallowed up as in a gulf.’ It is true then that the Son of God suffered ; but not in the Godhead. His Godhead could no more suffer, than the Godhead of the Father. But He took human nature, that He might suffer, and in His manhood the Son of God was crucified, and suffered and died.

And His death consisted not in the separation of His Divine Being from either Body or Soul. Then would not the Son of God have died at all. Then Christ would have been divided into two separate Persons, by the Godhead leaving the Manhood ; and the mystery and the blessing of the Incarnation would have been lost. The soul does not die by leaving the body, neither would the Son of God have died by leaving either

Body or Soul. It was the Person of Christ that suffered death; and as that Person was invested with the nature of man, death was to Him what death is to other men, viz. the separation of the human soul from the human body. The union of the Godhead with the manhood was not disturbed; but the human Soul of Christ left His human Body. But even when the Soul forsook the Body, the Godhead forsook neither Body nor Soul¹. 'If it had, then could we not truly hold either that the Person of Christ was buried; or that the Person of Christ did raise up itself from the dead. For the Body separated from the Word, can in no true sense be termed the Person of Christ, nor is it true to say that the Son of God, in raising up that Body, did raise up Himself, if the Body were not both with Him and of Him, even during the time it lay in the sepulchre. The like is also to be said of the Soul; otherwise we are plainly and inevitably Nestorians. The very Person of Christ therefore, for ever one and the selfsame, was, only touching bodily substance, concluded within the grave; His soul only from thence severed, but by Personal union His Deity still inseparably joined with both².'

¹ Ὅστε οὐκ ἄνθρωπος Θεοῦ ἐχωρίζετο, οὔτε Θεὸς πρὸς Θεὸν ἐγκατάλειψιν διηγείτο· οὔτε ἀποχώρησις Θεοῦ, ἢ ἀπὸ σώματος ἦν μετάστασις, ἀλλὰ ψυχῆς ἀπὸ σώματος χωρισμός.—Athanasius, *De Salut. Advent. Jesu Christ.* Tom. i. pp. 645, 6.

Compare the passage from Fulgentius quoted in the exposition of the next Article: *Secundum Divinitatem suam, quæ loco tenetur, nec fine concluditur, totus fuit in sepulchro cum carne, totus in inferno cum anima.*—Fulgent. *ad Thrasimund.* Lib. iii. ch. 34.

This is well expressed in some of the Calvinistic Confessions: *e. g.* *Confessio Belgica*, Art. xix.: *Cæterum duæ istæ naturæ ita sunt simul unitæ et conjunctæ in unam Personam, ut ne morte quidem separari poterint. Quod igitur Patri suo moriendo commendavit, id vere erat Spiritus humanus a corpore ipsius egrediens; at interim divina natura semper humanæ (etiam in sepulchro jacenti) conjuncta remansit: adeo ut Deitas ipsa non minus in ipso tunc fuerit, quam cum adhuc infans esset, etsi exiguum ad tempus non sese exerceret.*—*Sylloge*, p. 338.

² Hooker, v. LII. 4. The whole subject is admirably treated by Hooker; and by Pearson, Art. iv. 'Suffered,' 'Dead.'

3 The conclusion of the Article, which concerns the end and object of our blessed Saviour's sufferings, may be considered as anticipating the Eleventh Article, on Justification. As, however, in that Article there is no express mention of the sacrifice of Christ, it may be as well to speak briefly on that subject here.

The Socinians deny that there was any necessity for a propitiatory sacrifice, or that God had need to be reconciled to man. Man, say they, was at enmity with God, not God with man. Man therefore needed to be reconciled, and so Christ came to call men to repentance and to move them to it by His precept and example, and so committed to His disciples the ministry of reconciliation. But to say that God needed to have blood shed, and *that* the blood of an innocent and holy Victim, in order to appease His wrath, is to make God a vindictive and implacable Being, not a God of love.

The answer to this is twofold :

(1) 'A God all mercy is a God unjust :' Justice is an attribute of God as well as mercy. Justice therefore calling for wrath on man, and the love of God calling for mercy, it was necessary, in order to reconcile both these attributes of God, that some means should be devised for satisfying both. We do not say that God was tied to the means which He ordained ; but we learn that His wisdom ordained the sacrifice of His Son, and in that sacrifice we perceive a manifestation of infinite justice and infinite love.

(2) But the same thing appears too from many passages in Scripture. There is some ambiguity in the words used in the new Testament for 'reconciliation.' The most learned critics have observed that those words are used in a somewhat different sense from that in which the classical authors use them. But it is quite clear from the contexts, that in some passages God is spoken of as needing to be reconciled to man. For example, in 2 Cor. v. 19, where it is said that 'God was in Christ re-

conciling the world unto Himself,' there might be some ambiguity, if it were not added, 'not imputing their trespasses unto them:' but these words clear up the doubt. Indeed the whole context speaks as of two offended parties, God and man. God is represented as giving up His wrath and being reconciled through Christ, and then as sending to man to invite Him to give up his enmity and be reconciled to God¹. That the wrath of God is revealed from Heaven against sinful man seems hardly necessary to be proved. The Article on Original Sin is the more proper place for proving it. It may be sufficient now to refer to such passages as the following: Rom. v. 9. Eph. ii. 3. 1 Thess. i. 10. Heb. x. 26, 27. Rev. vi. 16, 17.

The Jewish sacrifices were expressly appointed to deliver from the wrath of God². The Passover was appointed that the wrath of God might be averted, when the firstborn of Egypt were slain. In the 4th and 5th Chapters of Leviticus, directions are given for the mode in which those who have sinned shall make atonement for their transgression. Whether it were priest, prince, or people, they were to bring a victim, to confess the sin upon the head of the victim, and then slay it as a sin-offering. The same is observable of the offerings on the day of expiation; when the high-priest made atonement, first for himself, and then for the people; and also of the scape-goat, which was offered at the same time, the sins of the people being confessed on his head (Lev. xvi.) The Jews looked on

¹ See at length Magee, *On Atonement*, Vol. i. p. 202, fifth edition, and the authors referred to there; especially Hammond and Whitby on Rom. v. 10, xi. 15; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, 20; Ephes. ii. 16; and Col. i. 20, 21.

² It is quite unnecessary to consider the question whether sacrifice was a rite in the first instance divinely instituted, or devised by man. If the latter be, as some learned and pious authors have believed, the truth, still it sprang from a natural feeling of guilt, and the need of atonement, and was sanctioned by Almighty God and made a type of Christ, and rules were given for its observance, that the type might be more clear and express. The argument in the text therefore would not be invalidated even if the divine institution of sacrifice be denied.

these sacrifices as strictly propitiatory¹. The Gentiles, who imitated them, evidently had a similar notion of their offerings; and those especially, who, in times of peculiar danger, had recourse to human sacrifice, appear to have entertained a strong feeling of the necessity of propitiating the gods with the noblest victims. That the legal sacrifices were types of the death of Christ, and therefore that Christ's death was a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of men, appears plainly from the fact that the terms taken from the Jewish sacrifices are applied in Scripture to describe the death of Christ. Thus He is said to have been 'led as a lamb to the slaughter' (see Isai. liii. 5—8). He is called 'the Lamb slain' (Rev. v. 6, 12; xiii. 8). 'A Lamb without blemish and spot' (1 Pet. i. 19); 'the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world' (John i. 29). St. Paul expressly compares the priesthood of Aaron with the priesthood of Christ; explaining to us that whereas the priest of old offered the blood of bulls and goats which could not take away sin, but availed only to a carnal purifying (Heb. ix. 13), so Christ offered, not the blood of others, but His own blood—offered Himself to bear the sins of many; and so put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. As under the Law, without shedding of blood was no remission, and as the patterns of heavenly things were purified with the blood of sacrificed victims, so the heavenly things themselves were purified with better sacrifices, even Christ. (See Heb. ix. x.)²

4 It may be well to observe one more expression which occurs at the very end of the Article, viz. 'to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.' It seems as if the reformers were anxious to meet a possible, perhaps an actual error, which, admitting the sacrifice of Christ

¹ Magee, as above, *Illustrations*, No. xxxiii.

² On the whole subject consult Magee, *On Atonement and Sacrifice*; especially the *Illustrations* at the end of Vol. I., and the Authors there referred to.

for original sin, either denied remission to actual sins, or looked for pardon of them to something beside the propitiation offered on the cross. That actual, and not only original sin, is pardoned for the sake of Christ, is taught repeatedly in the old Testament as well as the new.

Isaiah, besides saying that Christ 'was wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities,' adds a passage expressly indicating actual sin; 'All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all' (Isai. liii. 6). It is from '*all* iniquity' that 'He gave Himself to redeem us' (Tit. ii 14). It was when we were not only 'alienated' by original guilt, but 'enemies through *wicked works*' too, that Christ reconciled us (Col. i. 21). The persons, whom the Apostle speaks of as not capable of being saved by the law, but 'justified freely by God's grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus,' are described in the strongest terms as *actual* sinners (see Rom. iii. 12—26). And again (in 1 Cor. vi. 11) he paints the characters of some who had been 'justified in the name of the Lord Jesus,' as having been stained with the foulest vices and the deadliest sins. St. John (1 John ii. 1, 2) distinctly assures us, that 'if any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and He is the propitiation for our sins.' And that he meant actual sins is most apparent, because he begins the sentence with 'My little children, these things I write unto you that ye sin not.'

We conclude therefore that the sacrifice of Christ, the Son of God, offered by Him upon the cross, whereon in His human nature He suffered and died, is a propitiation not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.

ARTICLE III.

Of the going down of Christ into Hell.

As Christ died for us, and was buried; so also it is to be believed that He went down into hell.

De descensu Christi ad Inferos.

QUEMADMODUM Christus pro nobis mortuus est, et sepultus, ita est etiam credendus ad inferos descendisse.

TO the understanding of this Article it seems desirable to investigate, historically and from Scripture, **FIRST**, What is meant by '*Hell*;' **SECONDLY**, What is meant by Christ's descending into hell; **THIRDLY**, What was the purpose or object of that descent.

I propose therefore to depart from the arrangement adopted in the two former Articles, and to examine the meaning of the word '*Hell*,' first historically, and then scripturally—and next to proceed in the same manner with the doctrine of our Lord's descent into hell; and thirdly, with the reason or object of His going thither.

FIRST. The word '*Hell*,' as used in the Article, is plainly borrowed from the Apostles' Creed: for it appears that the first five Articles of the Church are little more than an amplification of the Articles of the Creed, intended to set forth that the Church of England continued truly Catholic in its doctrines, whilst it was constrained to protest against the corruptions of some branches of the Church. In the Latin, the word used is either '*infern*' or '*inferna*.' The Greek corresponding to this was either τὰ κατώτατα or ᾗδης; the former referring to Eph. iv. 9, the latter to Acts ii. 27. It has, however, generally been admitted, and may fairly be assumed, that the Greek word ᾗδης is the word of Scripture, which both the Creed and

the Article render *infern* and *hell*: and it has been observed that, according to their derivations, these words answer to one another. *Ἄδης* is something unseen, from *ἀ* and *εἶδον*. *Infern* is the Latin from the Greek word *ἐνέροι* or *ἐνφέροι*, *i. e.* those beneath the earth, the Manes or Spirits of the dead¹. *Hell* is from the same root as *hole* and *hellyer* (*i. e.* a roofer, a coverer), and signifies *the covered or hidden place*, the Saxon root being *helen*, to cover.

There is indeed another word in the New Testament often rendered in the English by *hell*. That word is *γέεννα*; and some confusion arises from this indiscriminate translation. As however neither the Creeds nor the Church have been wont to use *γέεννα* to express the place to which our Lord went after His death, we may lay aside the consideration of the word at present; merely observing, that it is the proper term in the new Testament for the state or place of damned souls and apostate spirits.

As regards then the signification of the word *Hades*, it will be well to consider the subject :

I. Historically.

II. Scripturally.

I. The history may be divided into

- 1 the use of the word among the Greeks,
- 2 among the Jews,
- 3 among the Christians.

¹ This seems a doubtful derivation. *Infer*, *Infra*, *Inferus*, *Inferior*, are obviously all connected. Though this connexion does not make the derivation given in the text impossible. The Greek *ἐρα* is the same as the Hebrew *אֶרֶץ*, in Chaldee and Syriac *אֶרְעָא*, in Arabic *أَرْض*. The latter is the same as the German *erde*, English *earth*. The Chaldee and Syriac *אֶרְעָא* is, in sound as well as in its radical letters, the same as the Greek *ἐρα*. And it is remarkable that it is used as a preposition to designate *below*, *אֶרֶץ מִנֶּךָ* *Infra te*. This may account for the force of the preposition *infra*, on the hypothesis that the derivation given in the text is correct.

1 It may be true that the Greeks sometimes used Hades to signify no more than the Grave; but if so, it was by an improper and less common use of the word. According to them, Hades, or the abode of Hades, was that place to which the Ghosts or Manes of the dead went after their burial. The unburied were detained on this side the Styx; the buried passed over, and mingled with the souls of men, which were there detained apart from the bodies they had left (εἰδωλα καμόντων). Hades himself was the deity who presided over these lower realms. In the abode of these disembodied souls were placed on the one hand the happy fields of Elysium, on the other the gloomy realms of Tartarus. In the former the souls of the virtuous enjoyed themselves, not however without regret for the loss of the body and the light of day. In the latter the wicked, such as Ixion, Tantalus, the Danaids and others, were tormented with various sorrows. This is known to every one who has read the *Odyssey* and the *Æneid*¹.

2 The Jews in like manner believed in a state of being after death, in which the soul existed previously to the final Resurrection, apart from the body, yet in a state of consciousness, either of happiness or of misery. This state or place they called in Hebrew, Sheol. (שְׁאוֹל), in Greek, Hades (ᾗδης). Its position, according to their notions and language, was underground. Thus Josephus says, that the soul of Samuel, when he appeared to Saul, came up (ἐξ ᾗδου) from Hades². He

¹ See Hom. *Od.* xi. Virg. *Æn.* vi. The latter describes the two sides of Hades thus:

Hic locus est partes ubi se via findit in ambas;
 Dexterâ, quæ Ditis magni sub mœnia tendit,
 Hac iter Elysium nobis: at læva malorum
 Exercet poenas, et ad impia Tartara mittit.

Æn. vi. 540—543.

² Joseph. *Ant.* Lib. xviii. c. ii. See Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. v. p. 239.

tells us that the Sadducees ‘took away the rewards and punishments of the Soul in Hades¹.’ Whereas he says of the Pharisees, that ‘they held the immortality of the Soul, and that men were punished or rewarded under the earth, according to their practice of virtue or wickedness in life².’ Lightfoot has shewn, that the Jewish schools dispose of the souls of the righteous, till the Resurrection, under a threefold phrase: (1) ‘the Garden of Eden,’ answering to the ‘Paradise’ of the new Testament (Luke xxiii. 43). (2) ‘Under the throne of glory,’ being nearly parallel with the expression (in Rev. vi. 9) of souls crying ‘under the altar;’ for the Jews conceived the altar to be the throne of the Divine Majesty. (3) ‘In Abraham’s bosom,’ which is the expression adopted by our Lord in the parable of Dives and Lazarus, Luke xvi. 22.³ He shews that the abode of the wicked before the Judgment is placed by the same Rabbins within sight of the abode of the just, and so that the one can converse with the other, as Dives is by our Lord represented as conversing with Abraham⁴. From these and similar authorities we may conclude, that the Jews, like the heathens, looked for a state immediately after death, which in their popular language was said to be underground, and in their ordinary phraseology was called Sheol, Hades, Hell: that in

¹ *De Bell. Jud.* Lib. II. Ψυχῆς τε τὴν διαμονὴν καὶ τὰς καθ’ ἑαυτοῦ τιμωρίας καὶ τιμὰς ἀναιρουῦσι.—Pearson, as above; King, *On the Creed*, p. 189.

² *Ant.* Lib. XVIII. c. II. ἀθανατόν τε ἰσχυρὸν ταῖς Ψυχαῖς πίστις αὐτοῖς εἶναι, καὶ ὑπὸ χθονὸς δικαιοσύνης τε καὶ τιμὰς, οἷς ἀρετῆς ἢ κακίας ἐπιτήδευσις ἐν τῇ βίῳ γέγρονε.—See Pearson, and King, as above.

³ See Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ*, on Luke xvi. 22; and Luke xxiii. 43.

⁴ *Horæ Hebr.* on Luke xvi. 23 26. See also Bp. Bull, *Works*, Vol. I. Disc. III. p. 59. Bp. Bull, p. 61, quotes from the Chaldee Paraphrase on Cant. iv. 12, who speaking of the garden of Eden (that is Paradise), says, that ‘thereinto no man hath the power of entering but the just, whose souls are carried thither by the hands of angels.’ ‘If this,’ adds the learned writer, ‘had been an erroneous opinion of the Jews, doubtless our Saviour would never have given any the least countenance to it, much less would he have plainly confirmed it, by teaching the same thing in the parable’ of Dives and Lazarus.

this state were both the just and the unjust; the latter in a state of misery, the former in blissful enjoyment, called sometimes 'Paradise, the Garden of Eden,' sometimes 'beneath the throne of glory,' sometimes 'in Abraham's bosom.'

3 It is well known that the early Christians believed in an intermediate state of the soul between death and Judgment: and this intermediate state they too, like the Jews, called 'Hades.' Justin Martyr, speaking against some of the Gnostics who denied the Resurrection, and by consequence the intermediate state of the soul, says, 'Those who say that there is no Resurrection, but that immediately after death their souls are taken up to heaven, these are not to be accounted either Christians or Jews¹.' In which passage, though he does not distinctly speak of an intermediate state, he plainly shews his disapproval of the notion, now most popular, that the soul immediately at death is received up to Heaven. Tertullian distinctly states his belief that the souls of all men go to Hades (*infern*) until the Resurrection; the souls of the just being in that part of Hades called the bosom of Abraham, or Paradise². Irenæus says that the souls of Christ's disciples 'go into the invisible place prepared for them, and there remain awaiting the

¹ Οἱ καὶ λέγουσι μὴ εἶναι νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν, ἀλλὰ ἅμα τῷ ἀποθνήσκειν, τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, μὴ ὑπολάβητε αὐτοὺς Χριστιάνους, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ Ἰουδαίους.—*Dial.* p. 307. Paris, 1615. That the still earlier apostolical fathers held the same sentiments concerning an intermediate state, may be seen from Clem. 1 Corinth. c. 50. Herm. III. Simil. ix. 16. On the former passage see Bull, *Works*, Vol. i. Serm. III. p. 63. Both his Sermons on this subject are deserving of all attention.

² Nobis inferi, non nuda cavositas, nec subdivalis aliqua mundi sentina creduntur; sed in fossa terræ et in alto vastitas, et in ipsis visceribus ejus abstrusa profunditas. . . . He then says, Christ went there, and his servants must not expect to be above their Lord, but will have to wait in Abraham's bosom for the resurrection. Nulli patet cœlum, terra adhuc salva, ne dixerim clausa. Cum transactione enim mundi reserabuntur regna cœlorum. . . . Habes etiam de Paradiso a nobis libellum, quo constituimus omnem animam apud inferos sequestrari in diem Domini.—Tertull. *De Anima*, cap. 55.

Resurrection ; after which they shall receive their bodies again, and rise complete, that is, in the body, as the Lord arose, and so shall come to the vision of God¹.’

Origen declares his belief that ‘not even the Apostles have received their perfect bliss ; for the saints at their departure out of this life do not attain the full rewards of their labours ; but are awaiting us who still remain on earth, loitering though we be, and slack².’

Lactantius is very express upon the same point. ‘Let no one,’ says he, ‘think that souls are judged immediately after death ; for they are all detained in the same common place of keeping, until the time come when the Supreme Judge shall enquire into their good or evil deeds³.’

Hilary says that it is the ‘law of human necessity that bodies should be buried, and souls descend to hell or Hades.’ And again, that ‘the faithful who depart out of the body are reserved in the safe keeping of the Lord for an entrance to the kingdom of Heaven, being in the meantime placed in Abraham’s bosom, whither the wicked cannot enter, on account of the great gulph fixed between them, until the time comes when they shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven⁴.’

¹ Αἱ ψυχαὶ ἀπέρχονται εἰς τὸν τόπον invisibilem, τὸν ὠρισμένον αὐταῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, κακεῖ μέχρι τῆς ἀναστάσεως φοιτῶσι, παραμένουσαι τὴν ἀνάστασιν· ἔπειτα ἀπολαβοῦσαι τὰ σώματα, καὶ ὁλοκλήρως ἀναστᾶσαι, τουτέστι σωματικῶς, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἀνεστη, οὕτως ἐλεύσονται εἰς τὴν ὄψιν τοῦ Θεοῦ.—Irenæ. v. 31. See also Beaven’s *Account of Irenæus*, ch. xviii.

² Nondum receperunt lætitiā suam ne Apostoli quidem, sed et ipsi expectant, ut et ego lætitiæ eorum particeps fiam. Neque enim decedentes hinc sancti continuo integra meritorum suorum præmia consequuntur, sed expectant etiam nos licet morantes, licet desides.—Origen. *Hom.* vii. in Lev. num. ii. ; Usher’s *Answer to a Jesuit*, ch. vii.

³ Nec tamen quisquam putet animas post mortem protinus judicari ; omnes in una communique custodia detinentur, donec tempus adveniat quo maximus Judex faciat examen.—Lactant. *Institut. Divin.* Lib. iii. c. 21 ; Usher, as above ; King, p. 202.

⁴ Humanæ ista lex necessitatis, ut sepultis corporibus ad inferos animæ descendunt.—Hilar. in Ps. cxxxviii. Edit. Benedict. p. 514.

Ambrose still more fully says, that 'while the fulness of time is expected, the souls await the reward which is in store for them. Some pain awaits, others glory. But in the meantime the former are not without trouble, nor are the latter without enjoyment¹.'

II. We have now to consider what we learn from *Scripture* of the state of the departed, and of the meaning of Hades.

1 The soul, after it has left the body, is not represented as passing directly to its final reward. This will appear from the following considerations :—

Our Lord distinctly assures us, that 'no one hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from Heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven' (John iii. 13). If then no one had then ascended up to Heaven, except the Lord Jesus, the saints departed could not have gone to their place of final and eternal bliss, which is always called Heaven.

Again, our Lord promised the thief on the cross 'that he should be with Him that day in Paradise' (Luke xxiii. 43). Now Christ did not go from the cross to Heaven, but, as will appear hereafter, He went to hell or Hades, and did not go to heaven till after His resurrection. Therefore Paradise, to which the thief went with Him that very day, was not Heaven².

Futuri boni expectatio est cum exeuntes de corpore ad introitum illum regni cœlestis, per custodiam Domini fideles omnes reservabuntur, in sinu scilicet interum Abrahæ collocati, quo adire impios interjectum chaos inhibet, quousque introeundi rursum in regnum cœlorum tempus adveniat. Hilar. in Ps. cxx. Edit. Benedict. p. 383. See Usher, and King, as above.

¹ Ergo dum expectatur plenitudo temporis expectant animæ remunerationem debitam. Alias manet pœna, alias gloria: et tamen nec illæ interim sine injuria, nec istæ sine fructu sunt. Ambros. *de Bono Mortis*. c. x. Usher, as above.

² Si ergo secundum hominem quem Verbum Dei suscepit, putamus dictum esse *Hodie mecum eris in Paradiso*, non ex his verbis in cœli existimandus est esse Paradisus. Neque enim ipso die in cœlo futurus erat

Again, in the Revelation (vi. 9), 'the souls of them that were slain for the word of God,' are not represented as in Heaven, but they cry from under the altar; and, though white robes are given them, they are bid 'to rest for a little season, till their fellow-servants and their brethren should be fulfilled.'

Again, our Lord and His Apostles never comfort the Church concerning those who are asleep, with the assurance that their souls are in Heaven, nor do they alarm the wicked with the fear that at the instant of death their souls will pass into the state of final punishment. It is ever to the Resurrection of the dead and the Judgment of the great day that the hopes of the pious and the fears of the ungodly are directed. This may be seen most plainly by referring to such passages as the following. Matt. xiii. 40; xvi. 27; xxv. 31—33. Mark viii. 38. Luke xiv. 14. John v. 28, 29. Acts xvii. 31. 1 Cor. xv. *passim*. 2 Cor. iv. 14; v. 10, 11. Phil. iii. 20, 21. Col. iii. 4. 1 Thess. iv. 13—17; v. 2, 3, 23. 2 Thess. i. 6—9. 2 Tim. iv. 1, 8. Heb. ix. 27, 28. Jas. v. 7, 8. 1 Pet. iv. 5; v. 4. 2 Pet. iii. 10—12. Rev. xx. 13—15.

2 But though the soul does not receive its final reward until the Resurrection and the Judgment, when it shall be united to the body, and receive the sentence of the Judge; yet the soul does not die with the body, nor sleep in unconsciousness, between death and Judgment¹. This appears from the following.

homo Christus Jesus, sed in inferno secundum animam, in sepulchro autem secundum carnem. August. *Epist. LVII. ad Dardanum*. Edit. Benedict. *Ep. CLXXXVII*. Tom. II. p. 679.

¹ The reformers of the Church of England were so strongly of this opinion, that they put forth the following in the reign of Edward VI., as one of the Articles of the Church. It is the 40th of the 42 Articles of 1552:

'The souls of them that depart this life do neither die with the bodies nor sleep idly.'

The soul of Samuel returned to earth after his body was in the grave (1 Sam. xxviii. 11, 14). This took place four years after Samuel's death. In the parable or history in Luke xvi., both Lazarus and Dives are represented as alive, one in torments and the other in Abraham's bosom: and that all this took place before the Resurrection and the Judgment, appears from this, that in vv. 27, 28 the brothers of the rich man were then alive on earth and in their state of probation, and Dives wished that Lazarus should be sent to them to bring them to repent. It is therefore quite clear that the present world was still in existence, and therefore Judgment yet future. The same observations apply in all particulars to the account given of the souls beneath the altar, so often referred to, in Rev. vi. 9—11. The promise also to the thief upon the Cross, that he should be that day with Christ in Paradise (Luke xxiii. 43), must shew that his soul would not be in a state of insensibility, but of bliss.

The same may be inferred from the words of our Lord, 'Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul' (Matt. x. 28). If death be not only corruption of the body, but insensibility of the soul, then men *can* kill the soul, as much as they can kill the body; for they cannot kill the body eternally, nor prevent its rising again. They can kill the body and reduce it to corruption now; but the soul they cannot kill, neither now, nor ever.

Again, the language used by our Lord and St. Stephen at the instant of death shew that the spirit would live: 'Father, into Thy hands I commend My Spirit,' said Christ (Luke xxiii. 46). 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit,' said Stephen (Acts vii. 59).

'They which say that the souls of such as depart hence do sleep, being without all sense, feeling or perceiving, until the day of Judgment, or affirm that the souls die with the bodies, and at the last day shall be raised up with the same, do utterly dissent from the right belief declared to us in holy Scripture.'

St. Paul speaks of the Church as among other companies, having in it 'the spirits of just men made perfect' (Heb. xii. 23); where the whole context shews that he refers to the present, not to the future state of Christian privilege and blessing. He declares of himself, that he is in a strait between two, 'having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better.' But if death be annihilation until the Resurrection wakes both body and soul, he could hardly have called death better than life, nor have spoken of it as 'being with Christ' (Phil. i. 23). And again, the same Apostle, speaking of death, and calling the body a tabernacle of the soul (2 Cor. v. 1, 2), says, 'Whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord:' and then adds, 'we are willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord' (vv. 6—8).

From all this we must conclude, that the spirit still lives, when it has left the body, and that, though it loses the benefit of having a bodily tabernacle, yet, in the case of pious men, it is very vastly a gainer by death, inasmuch as, though absent from the body, it enjoys the presence of Christ.

3 Having thus seen that the disembodied soul neither sleeps nor enters into its final reward; we have only farther to shew, that the soul is in an intermediate state, called Sheol or Hades; and that that state is a state of partial and expectant bliss to the righteous, of partial and expectant misery to the wicked, preparatory to the final consummation of bliss or misery, to be assigned to each at the Resurrection of the last day.

It has been seen that this was the opinion of the Jews, and also that our Lord and the Apostles use the very expressions which Lightfoot has shewn that the Jews used, concerning the state of the departed, viz. 'Paradise,' 'Abraham's bosom,' and 'beneath the altar,' answering to 'beneath the throne of glory.' This would of itself imply that our Lord and His Apostles sanctioned the sentiments of the Jews upon the

subject. The same has appeared concerning the Jewish use of the term Hades, which is a term frequently adopted by the writers of the new Testament.

The various passages of Scripture already referred to fully confirm this view of the case. For example, the souls beneath the altar are clothed in white robes, and comforted with hope; but plainly not in perfect consummation and bliss. St. Paul (in 2 Cor. v. 1—8), when looking forward to the hope of resurrection, distinctly describes the state of the disembodied soul as imperfect, and though he says it is 'better to be absent from the body, and present with the Lord' (ver. 8), he still says that our earnest desire is for the resurrection of the body, which he calls being 'clothed upon' (ver. 4). Again (Rom. viii. 19—23), he represents the whole creation as longing to be delivered from bondage, and waiting for the redemption of the body. In Heb. xi. 40 he represents the saints departed as not 'made perfect,' until those who should succeed them were added to the number of the redeemed.

To these passages we must add the promise to the thief upon the cross, that he should be in Paradise, a place evidently of bliss, yet, as has already been seen, not the same as Heaven. Lazarus is spoken of as *comforted* in Abraham's bosom; an expression by no means answering to the glowing descriptions of the eternal Kingdom of God, though corresponding with the Jewish and early Christian ideas of the state of intermediate bliss. Dives, too, is represented as being in the same place with Lazarus, though separated by a great gulph from him, and, unlike him, suffering torment; and that place is expressly called Hades (Luke xvi. 23). In correspondence with all this we find in the old Testament that Jacob expected 'to go down to Sheol (i. e. Hades) unto his son' (Gen. xxxvii. 35). Korah, Dathan and Abiram are said to go down 'quick into Sheol' (Num. xvi. 30); and when the king of Babylon's fate is foretold by Isaiah, it is said that 'Hades or Sheol from beneath shall

be moved to meet him ;' which is explained by what follows, that the 'mighty dead shall be stirred up' at his approach (Isai. xiv.). I think it hardly necessary to add more, to shew that on this point the opinion of the ancients is more correct than that of the modern popular creeds ; and that the Roman Catholic notions of purgatory, the common opinion that the soul at once passes to its final reward, and the belief that the soul sleeps from death to Judgment, are all without support from the Scriptures of God. Those Scriptures plainly speak of the final reward to be attained only at the Resurrection ; yet they shew too that the soul is in a state of consciousness between death and Judgment. That state of consciousness is evidently a happy, though not a perfect state to the good, a suffering, though not a fully miserable state to the wicked. This state also is called at times by various names, but its general designation, whether as regards the just or the unjust, is in the Hebrew *Sheol*, in the Greek *Hades*, and both these words (as well as others of a different signification) are generally rendered by our English translators *hell*.

Our SECOND consideration is, What is meant by our Lord's descent to hell—and what authority there is for the doctrine.

I. Historically.

The article, 'He descended into hell,' was not very anciently in the Creeds. The first place we find it used in was the church of Aquileia¹, about A. D. 400. Yet it is contained in a sort of exposition of the Christian faith given by Eusebius, which he translated from the Syriac, and which he states to have been given by Thaddæus, the brother of the apostle Thomas, to the people of Edessa². It is not, however, in the Creeds of

¹ Pearson, p. 225.

² Euseb. i. 13 ; Bingham, x. 4, 18 ; Hey, Bk. iv. Art. iii. § 1 ; Hammond's *Pract. Catech.* Bk. v. § 2.

Irenæus, Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, in the Creed of the Council of Nice, nor in the more ancient draughts of the Roman or Apostles' Creed. Still there can be no question of its very general acceptance, as an article of faith, by all the earlier fathers of the Church. Ignatius, Hermas, Justin M., Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Cyprian, have all spoken clearly on this subject; besides later fathers, such as Cyril, Ambrose, Jerom, Augustine, Chrysostom. It will be necessary to refer more particularly to the sentiments of some of these fathers, when we come to our THIRD division, concerning the object of Christ's descent. At present let it suffice to quote a few of the more striking as well as the best known passages from some of the earliest Christian writers. Irenæus says that 'our Lord was in the middle of the shadow of death, where are the souls of the dead, and after that rose again with His Body¹.' Tertullian, in a chapter before quoted, says, that 'Christ, who is God, yet being man too, died according to the Scriptures, was buried, and went through the form of human death in Hades; nor did He ascend into Heaven till He had gone down to the lower parts of the earth².' Cyprian shews that Our Lord 'was not to be overcome by death, nor to remain in hell³.' Lord King says that in sundry places Athanasius shews⁴, 'that whilst Christ's Body lay buried in the grave, His

¹ Irenæ. v. 31. Cum enim Dominus in medio umbræ mortis abierit, ubi animæ mortuorum erant, post deinde corporaliter resurrexit. See Pearson, p. 237; and Beaven's *Account of Irenæus*, ch. xviii.

² *De Anima*. c. lv. Quod si Christus Deus, quia et homo, mortuus secundum Scripturas, et sepultus secundum easdem, hic quoque legi satisfecit, forma humanæ mortis apud inferos functus, nec ante ascendit in sublimiora cœlorum, quam descendit in inferiora terrarum, &c.

³ Quod a morte non vinceretur, nec apud inferos remansurus erat. Cyp. *Test. adv. Judæ.* 1, 2. c. 24.

⁴ King, p. 179. The words are Lord King's, not Athanasius'. Nevertheless, Athanasius' language may justify Lord King's statement... μήτε τῆς θεότητος τοῦ σώματος ἐν τῷ τάφῳ ἀπολιμπομένης, μήτε τῆς ψυχῆς ἐν τῷ ᾧ ἔδη χωριζομένης, τοῦτο γὰρ ἔτι τὸ ρηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν, οὐκ εγκαταλείψει

Soul went into hell, to perform in that place those several actions, and operations, which were necessary for the complete redemption and salvation of mankind; that He performed after His death different actions by His two essential parts; by His Body He lay in the grave, by His Soul He went into hell and vanquished death.'

One principal reason why the fathers laid great stress on the belief in Christ's descent to Hades, was this. The Arians and Apollinarians denied the existence of a natural human soul in Jesus Christ¹. Now the true doctrine of our Lord's humanity, viz. that 'He was perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting,' was most strongly maintained by asserting the Article of His descent to Hades. For whereas His Body was laid in the grave, and His Soul went down to Hades, He must have had both Body and Soul². Accordingly the fathers with one consent maintain the descent of Christ's Soul to Hell.

II. The Scriptural proof of our Lord's descent to Hades rests chiefly on three passages. One is the difficult verse, 1 Pet. iii. 19, which was generally esteemed by the fathers to apply to this subject; and was thought conclusive by the reformers of the reign of Edward VI. Yet as many of our most learned

τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς ᾗδην οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὄσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν . . . διὰ τοῦτο ἐν μὲν ψυχῇ Θεοῦ ἡ κράτησις τοῦ θανάτου ἐλύετο καὶ ἐξ ᾗδου ἀνάστασις ἐγίνετο, καὶ ταῖς ψυχαῖς εὐηγγελίζετο· ἐν δὲ σώματι Χριστοῦ ἡ φθορὰ κατηργεῖτο. κ. τ. λ. Athanas. *de Salut. Advent. Jes. Christ. ad v. Apollinarum*. Tom. i. p. 645.

¹ See an account of their doctrines under Art. II. § 1.

² Most pertinent is the passage of Fulgentius *ad Thrasimund*. Lib. III. c. 44, quoted by Pearson, p. 238. *Humanitas vera Filii Dei nec tota in sepulchro fuit, nec tota in inferno; sed in sepulchro secundum veram carnem Christus mortuus jacuit, et secundum animam ad infernum Christus descendit. . . . Secundum divinitatem vero suam, quæ nec loco tenetur, nec fine concluditur, totus fuit in sepulchro cum carne, totus in inferno cum anima; ac per hoc plenus fuit ubique Christus, quia non est Deus ab humanitate quam susceperat separatus, &c.*

So Hilary, in Ps. cxxxviii. *Quam descensionem Dominus ad consummationem veri hominis non recusavit.*

divines have denied its application, I shall defer the consideration of the question till we come to speak of the *object* of Christ's descent.

Another passage is Eph. iv. 9: 'Now that He ascended, what is it but that He also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?'

It is undoubted that both Jews and Greeks placed Hades, according to their popular notions, beneath the earth, or in the lower parts of the earth; and it is not improbable that the Apostle may have used this popular language to express our Lord's descent or passage to the place of disembodied souls. It is undoubted too, that some of the fathers and creeds adopted these words, or words similar to them (*τὰ κατώτατα*)¹, to express the doctrine of the descent to Hades. And Bishop Pearson has truly observed, that this exposition of the passage 'must be confessed so probable, that there can be no argument to disprove it.' Yet there is also no question that the Apostle's language might be used to express merely the fact of the incarnation, or of the burial of Christ. The 'lower parts of the earth' may mean only the place beneath, *i. e.* the earth itself, in contradistinction to the heights of Heaven.

Although then both these passages may, and we may not be far wrong in saying that they both very probably do, refer to our Lord's descent to the place or state of departed souls; yet seeing this application is open to doubt, it may be well to rest the doctrine on a passage, the force of which can hardly be evaded. That passage is Acts ii. 27—31. St. Peter there quotes the sixteenth Psalm, 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades (*eis ᾗδου*), neither wilt Thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption:' and he explains it that the Psalmist 'spake of the resurrection of Christ, that His soul was not left in Hades,

¹ See Pearson, pp. 226, 228. Irenæus, Origen, Athanasius, Jerom, all quote this passage to prove or express the descent into hell.

neither His flesh did see corruption¹.’ In which explanation by the Apostle, it is plain that the *soul* is in antithesis to the *flesh*, and *Hades* to *corruption*; so that the miracle of our Lord’s resurrection was the consequence of His flesh not being suffered to be corrupted in the grave, and His Soul not being suffered to remain in Hades. That is to say, Our Lord had a human nature like our own. When human beings die, the soul leaves the body; the latter is laid in the grave, the former passes to the intermediate state of souls. With ordinary men, the body sees corruption, the soul is left in Hades till the Judgment. But with Christ, though He fully passed into the state of death, yet death did not retain dominion over him. Although therefore His Body was laid in the sepulchre, it saw not corruption; although His Soul went to Hades, where other souls go, yet God did not leave it there, but it was on the third day reunited to the Body, and so the Body was raised from the grave.

If it be necessary to add anything to this passage, we may further remark that, as it has already been shewn that Paradise is the state of the departed souls of the redeemed; so our Lord’s promise to the thief upon the cross, that he should be with Him that day in Paradise, proves clearly that our Lord, and with Him the repentant thief, passed from the cross into the state of the souls of the dead, which, as has been shewn, is called Hades or hell. It was indeed into the happy division of Hades called Paradise, or Abraham’s bosom; but still it was to part of Hades².

¹ Et Dominum quidem carne mortificatum venisse in infernum, satis constat. Neque enim contradici potest vel prophetiæ quæ dixit, *Quoniam non derelinques animam meam in inferno*: quod ne aliter quisquam sapere auderet, in Actibus Apostolorum idem Petrus exponit. Augustin. *Epist.* CLXIV. Tom. II. p. 574.

² So the author of the Homily on Dives and Lazarus, attributed to Chrysostom: Dicat mihi aliquis, in inferno est Paradisus? Ego hoc dico, quia sinus Abraham Paradisi veritas est; sed et sanctissimum Paradisum fateor. Homil. in Luc. xvi. *De Divite*. Tom. II. *Oper. Chrysost.* Latin. Usher, *Answer to a Jesuit*, ch. viii.

We now come to the THIRD division of our subject, to consider what was the *object* of our Lord's descent to Hades.

I. Historically, we must consider this subject as briefly as we can.

1. It has already been seen, that many of the fathers looked on the belief in our Lord's passage to Hades as necessary for the acknowledgment of the verity of His manhood and of His death. This indeed appears to have been the universal sentiment of the primitive Church ; and accordingly the descent to Hades was urged by the fathers against the Apollinarian heresy¹.

2 But though this may be said to have been the universal sentiment of the early Christians, there were also various opinions current among them, as to what our Lord did during His stay among the souls of the dead.

Almost universal appears to have been the belief, that the Spirit or Soul of Christ preached the Gospel to the souls of the dead². Hermas, who is reckoned apostolical, has set forth the doctrine, that not only Christ preached to the spirits in Hades ; but that the Apostles too preached, to those who had died before them, the name of the Son of God³. In this he is followed and quoted by Clement of Alexandria⁴.

Irenæus, again, says that he heard from a certain presbyter, who heard it from those who had seen the Apostles, that our Lord descended to the places beneath the earth, and preached

¹ See under the second division of this article passages from Irenæus, Tertullian, Athanasius, Fulgentius. See also Pearson, p. 238.

² καθιζόμενος ἐν τοῖς κατωτάτοις τοῦ ᾗδου μυχοῖς, καὶ διακηρύξας τοῖς ἐκεῖσε πνεύμασι. Cyril. Alex. *Hom. Paschal.* xx. Usher, *Answer to a Jesuit*, ch. viii.

³ Lib. iii. Simil. ix. c. xvi. Coteler, i. p. 117.

⁴ *Stromat.* vi. Potter, pp. 763, 764. See Bp. Kaye's *Clement of Alexandria*, p. 189.

His Gospel to those who were there; and all believed in Him who had foretold His advent—the just, the prophets, the patriarchs; whose sins He forgave, as He does ours¹.

The passage of Scripture on which this general belief of the early Christians was founded, is 1 Pet. iii. 19. Justin Martyr and Irenæus also quote a passage from Isaiah or Jeremiah, which is not extant in any copies of the Bible. The passage is this, ‘The Lord God remembered His dead, who slept in the sepulchral earth, and descended to them to preach His salvation².’ Justin charges the Jews with having erased it from the LXX. Of the spuriousness of the text there can be no doubt, but it sufficiently shews the judgment of those fathers who quoted it, concerning the doctrine which it was adduced to prove.

Thus far then the early Christians appear almost unanimous. On the purpose or end of Christ’s preaching, however, there existed no small difference.

(1) The earlier fathers seem generally to have held that no change took place in the condition of souls after our Lord’s descent among them, and in consequence of His preaching to them. Justin Martyr held that all souls still remain in Hades; the just in a happy, the unjust in a wretched place, and so shall remain to the Judgment³. Irenæus and Tertullian are clearly of the same opinion. The former says⁴, that ‘no

¹ Iren. Lib. iv. c. xxvii. 2.

² Justin M. *Dial.* § 72, p. 398. Iren. iii. 22. iv. 39. v. 31.

³ See the passage quoted in the note under the FIRST head, i. 3. Pearson also quotes the following from Just. *Dial.* p. 223: ἀλλὰ μὲν οὐδὲ ἀποθνήσκειν φημὶ πάσας τὰς ψυχὰς ἐγὼ (ἔρμαιον γὰρ ἦν ὡς ἀληθῶς τοῖς κακοῖς) ἀλλά τι; τὰς μὲν εὐσεβῶν ἐν κρείττονί που χώρῳ μένει, τὰς δὲ ἀδίκους καὶ πονηρὰς ἐν χείρονι, τὸν τῆς κρίσεως ἐκδεχομένας χρόνον τότε. Pearson, p. 240.

⁴ Nunc autem (Dominus) tribus diebus conversatus est ubi erant mortui. . . . Cum autem Dominus in medio umbræ mortis abierit, ubi animæ mortuorum erant. . . . manifestum est quia et discipulorum ejus, propter

disciple is above his master,' and thence infers that as our Lord went to Hades, so all His servants shall go thither. Tertullian asserts that 'Heaven is not open until the end of the world',¹ and that all men are in Hades either comforted or tormented². Accordingly, he says that our Lord's descent to Hades was, that the patriarchs might be made partakers of Him³.

(2) But on the other hand, many of the early Christians were of opinion that our Lord, when He descended to Hades, delivered some who were there, and carried them thence to some better place.

Some thought that the prophets and patriarchs were in Hades till the coming of Christ, and that after that they were translated to a better place, called Paradise; whilst others again believed that our Lord preached His Gospel to the souls of the dead, and that those who believed in Him were saved and delivered from Hades, those who rejected Him were condemned.

There seem traces of this opinion in the above-noticed passage of Hermas, commonly called an apostolical father, and in Clement of Alexandria, who followed him. Origen, however, appears to be the first who distinctly propounded the opinion, that, after the coming of Christ, the souls of the just, instead

quos et hoc operatus est Dominus αἱ ψυχὰι ἀνέρχονται εἰς τὸν τόπον invisibilem τὸν ὀρισμένον αὐταῖς . . . *Nemo enim discipulus super magistrum: perfectus autem omnis erit sicut magister ejus.* Quomodo ergo magister noster non statim evolans abiit, sed sustinens definitum a Patre resurrectionis tempus, post triduum resurgens assumptus est; sic et nos sustinere debemus definitum a Deo resurrectionis tempus, prænuntiatum a prophetis, et sic resurgentes assumi. Irenæ. v. 31.

¹ *De Anima*, c. LV., quoted above.

² *De Anima*, c. LVIII.

³ Descendit in inferiora terrarum, ut illic patriarchas et prophetas compotes sui faceret. *De Anima*, c. LV.

See also *adv. Marcion*. Lib. IV. c. XXXIV. Also Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, p. 262.

of going to Hades, pass at once to some better place, called Paradise¹.

Accordingly, the later fathers generally adopted the notion that, till Christ's death, the patriarchs and prophets were in Hades, but afterwards (from the time that Christ promised to the thief on the cross that he should be with Him in Paradise) they passed into Paradise, which therefore they distinguished from Hades². Hades indeed they looked on as a place of rest to the just, but Paradise as far better³.

¹ This is apparent as the opinion of Origen in the whole of the 2nd Homily on the 1st Book of Kings, known as the Homily *de Engastrimytho*. There he argues that the soul of Samuel, which was called up by the witch of Endor, was in Hades; so were the souls of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and the prophets; none of them could pass the flaming sword, till Christ came to set them free. Therefore it was that Lazarus, though in Abraham's bosom, could see Dives who was in torments. But after Christ is come, Christians can pass the flaming sword into Paradise without harm. Paradise, however, was not in Heaven, according to Origen, but still an intermediate state, though better than Hades. This appears from the following, if Ruffinus has rightly translated him:—*Puto enim quod sancti discedentes de hac vita permanebunt in loco aliquo in terra posito quem Paradisum dicit Scriptura divina, velut in quodam eruditionis loco, et, ut ita dixerim, auditorio vel schola animarum in quo de omnibus his quæ in terris viderant doceantur, indicia quoque quædam accipiant etiam de futuris, &c. De Principiis, Lib. II. cap. XI. num. 6.*

Bp. Beveridge, on this Article, quotes a passage from Ignatius, which should shew that that ancient father took the same view as Origen and others after him. The passage, however, is from an interpolated Epistle, and therefore proves nothing. *Ad Trall. IX. Coteler, Vol. II. p. 64.*

² Dominus resurrectionis sua pignore vincula solvit inferni, et piorum animas elevavit. Ambros. *de Fide ad Gratian. Lib. IV. c. 1.*

Ante adventum Christi omnia ad inferos pariter ducerentur. Unde et Jacob ad inferos pariter descensurum se dicit; et Job pios et impios in inferno queritur retentari: et evangelium chaos magnum interpositum apud inferos esse testatur, et revera antequam flammeam illam rotam et igneam rhomphæam ad Paradisi fores Christus cum latrone reseraret, clausa erant cœlestia. Hieronym. *Com. in Eccles. c. III. Tom. V. p. 26.* (Paris. 1602). Quoted in part by King, p. 209. See also Pearson, p. 250.

³ Si enim non absurde videtur, antiquos etiam sanctos, qui venturi Christi tenuerunt fidem, locis quidem a tormentis impiorum remotissimis,

Here, of course, we begin to perceive the germ of the doctrine of the *Limbus Patrum*. Yet that the notion entertained by the fathers was vastly different from that of the mediæval Church, will be sufficiently apparent to any one who will read the passages which have been thrown into the notes.

Another opinion, however, grew up also in the early ages, viz. that Christ not only translated the pious from Hades to more joyous abodes, but that even some of those, who in old times had been disobedient, yet, on hearing Christ's preaching, believed, and so were saved and delivered from torment and hell¹. This appears to have been the opinion of Augustine. He was evidently puzzled as to the meaning of the word Hades,

sed apud inferos fuisse, donec eos inde sanguis Christi et ad ea loca descensus erueret, profecto deinceps boni fideles effuso illo pretio jam redempti, prorsus inferos nesciunt, donec etiam receptis corporibus, bona recipiant quæ merentur. August. *de Civit. Dei*, Lib. xx. c. xv. Tom. vii. p. 593. Quoted in part by King, p. 212. See also *Epist. clxiv.* Tom. viii. p. 575; *Epist. clxxxvii.* p. 679.

¹ Expers peccati Christus, cum ad Tartari ima descendens seras inferni januasque confringens, vinctas peccato animas, mortis dominatione destructa, e diaboli faucibus revocavit ad vitam. Ambros. *de Mystério Paschæ*, c. 4.

Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, qui ad fornacem descendit inferni, in quo clausæ et peccatorum et justorum animæ tenebantur, ut absque exustione et noxa sui eos, qui tenebantur inclusi, mortis vinculis liberaret. Hieron. Lib. i. in *Daniel.* c. iii. Tom. iv. p. 1119.

Invocavit ergo redemptor noster nomen Domini de lacu novissimo, cum in virtute divinitatis descendit ad inferos, et destructis clausis Tartari, suos quos ibi reperit eruens, victor ad superos ascendit. Id. Lib. ii. in *Lamentat.* c. iii. Tom. iv. p. 710.

Nec ipsam tamen rerum partem noster salvator mortuus pro nobis visitare contempsit, ut inde solveret quos esse solvendo secundum divinam secretamque justitiam ignorare non potuit. Augustin. *de Genesi. ad literam.* Lib. xii. c. 66. Tom. iii. p. 322.

Κατελθὼν γὰρ εἰς ᾄδου, καὶ τοῖς ἐκεῖσε διακηρύξας πνεύμασιν, ἀνείς τε τοῖς κάτω τὰς κεκλεισμένας πύλας καὶ τὸν ἀπληστον τοῦ θανάτου κενώσας μυχὸν ἀνεβίω τριήμερος. Cyril. Alex. *Hom. Paschal.* xi.

σεσύλητο τῶν πνευμάτων ὁ ᾄδης. Id. *Hom.* vi.

See most of these and some other passages referred to in Usher's *Answer to a Jesuit*, ch. viii.

and doubted whether it ever meant a place of rest and happiness (although at times he appears to have admitted that it did); and thinking it a place of torment, he thought Christ went thither to save some souls, which were in torment, from thence¹. Some indeed went so far as to think that hell was cleared of all the souls who were there in torment, and that all were taken up with Christ, when He arose from the dead, and ascended into Heaven. But this was reckoned as a heresy².

Such were the principal varieties of opinion in early ages touching the end of Christ's descent to hell³.

In more modern times, many other sentiments have been adopted. Among the rest the opinion held by Calvin⁴ appears to have been, that our Lord's descent to hell means not His going to the place of spirits, but His suffering upon earth, in Gethsemane and on the cross, all the torments of hell, and the sufferings of damned souls. Dr. Hey thinks that the growing popularity of Calvin's views induced the reformers of Elizabeth's reign to omit the latter part of the Third Article as put forth in Edward's reign, because it was not acceptable to those who followed Calvin on this head.

Others again have supposed that our Lord went down to hell, (taking hell in the sense of Gehenna, the place of the

¹ See Augustin. *Epist.* CLXIV. Tom. II. p. 573. Pearson, p. 241, refers to it as *Epist.* XCIX. Concerning Augustine's doubts on the nature of Hades, see Pearson, p. 239; King, p. 210; and the places referred to *supra* note 3, pp. 124, 5.

² Augustine, in his book *de Hæresibus*, reckons this as the seventy-ninth heresy. *Alia, descendente ad infernos Christo, credidisse incredulos et omnes inde existimat liberatos.* Tom. VIII. p. 23. See Pearson, p. 241, note.

³ Tertullian mentions, but does not approve, of an opinion in his day, that Christ went to Hades that we should not go thither:—*Sed in hoc, inquit, Christus inferos adiit ne nos adiremus.* *De Anima*, c. 55.

⁴ See Calvin, *Institut.* Lib. II. c. 16, § 10; quoted by Pearson, p. 230, where see Pearson's own observations on this notion.

damned), and that He went there in order to meet and confront Satan in his own abode, and as He had conquered him on earth, so finally to subdue him in hell¹.

II. To pass from the *Historical* to the *Scriptural* consideration of the end of Christ's descent to Hades, we may observe :

1 That it is plain He went thither, that He might fulfil the conditions of death proper to human nature. When man dies, the spirit leaves the body, the body is buried, the spirit goes to the abode of the departed, where the souls of men await the Resurrection of the dead. Christ fulfilled this two-fold condition. His Body was buried, and His Soul passed into Hades or Paradise. This it is unnecessary to dwell upon, as it seems evident that, as our Lord was perfect man, so it was His will and the will of His Father, that He should undergo all the conditions of human nature, and especially that He should truly suffer death. Now death cannot be truly suffered, unless the soul leaves the body, and goes to the abode of departed spirits.

2 But it becomes necessary here to consider whether the text 1 Pet. iii. 18, 19, (which was so applied by all the fathers, and by the English reformers of the reign of Edward the Sixth) gives us any farther account of the end and object of Christ's descent to Hades. Many divines of the English Church deny altogether its applicability to this question. Writers of no less

¹ On the other hand, Mede (Disc. iv. *Works*, p. 23, Lond. 1677) has made it most probable, if not certain, that Satan is not yet cast into hell, but that evil spirits are allowed to walk to and fro on the earth. So Satan is called the prince of the powers of the air, and it is not till the Judgment that he is to be cast into hell. This, like most of J. Mede's learned discourses, is well worth reading.

See also this view of the end and character of our Lord's descent into hell considered and disproved by Bp. Pearson, p. 248.

name than Hammond, Pearson, Barrow, &c. contend that the only meaning of St. Peter's words is, that our Lord by His Holy Spirit, inspiring Noah, preached to the disobedient antediluvians, who are now for their disobedience imprisoned in hell¹.

This interpretation of the passage depends on the accuracy of the English version. That version reads in the eighteenth verse 'quickened by the Spirit.' It is to be noted, however, that all the ancient versions except one (the Ethiopic) seem to have understood it 'quickened in spirit:' and it is scarcely possible, upon any correct principles of interpretation, to give any other translation to the words². If therefore we follow the original, in preference to the English version, we must read the passage thus: 'Christ suffered for us, the Just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God; being put to death in the flesh, but quick in His Spirit; by which (or in which) He went and preached (or proclaimed) to the spirits in safe keeping,' &c. There is, it will be observed, a marked antithesis between 'flesh' and 'spirit.' In Christ's Flesh or Body, He was put to death. Men were 'able to kill the body,' but they

¹ A question as to whether this might be the meaning of the passage, had been proposed by St. Jerome and St. Augustine. Hieron. Lib. xv. in *Esai.* cap. LIV. August. *Epist.* CLXIV. See Usher's *Answer to a Jesuit*, ch. viii.

² The words in the Greek are *θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ, ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ τῷ πνεύματι*. The article *τῷ* before *πνεύματι* is of so little authority, that Wetstein, Griesbach, and Matthai, have rejected it from the text. Bishop Middleton has observed that in order to admit of the rendering of the English version, or to allow us to understand by 'Spirit' here the Holy Spirit of God, it would be absolutely necessary that there should be not only an article, but a preposition also before *πνεύματι*. If the article be not authentic, we must render 'dead carnally, but alive spiritually.' If we admit the article, we must then translate, 'dead in body, but alive in His Spirit,' i. e. in His soul. The ancient versions support this rendering, and Michaelis and Rosenmüller give a similar interpretation. Bp. Middleton refers with full approbation to Bp. Horsley's Sermon mentioned below. See Middleton, *On the Article*, in *loc.*

could not kill His Soul. He was therefore alive in His Soul¹, and ~~is~~ or *by* that He went to the souls who were in safe custody (*ἐν φυλακῇ*); His Body was dead, but His Spirit, or Soul, went to their spirits or souls. This is the natural interpretation of the passage; and if it ended here, it would contain no difficulty, and its sense would never have been doubted. It would have contained a simple assertion of our Lord's descent to the spirits of the dead².

But it is added, that He not only went to the spirits in safe keeping, but that He went and *preached* to them. Hence it has been inferred that, if He preached, they had need of, and He offered to them, repentance. Hence the passage has appeared to savour of false doctrine, and hence its force has been explained away. But the word 'preached,' or 'proclaimed,' by no means necessarily infers that He preached either faith or repentance. Christ had just finished the work of salvation, had made an end of sin, and conquered hell. Even the angels seem not to be fully enlightened as to all the work of grace which God performs for man. It is not likely, then, that the souls of the departed patriarchs should have fully understood or known all that Christ had just accomplished for them. They indeed may have known, and no doubt did know, the great truth, that redemption was to be wrought for all men by the sufferings and death of the Messiah. But before the accomplishment of this great work, neither angels nor devils seem fully to have understood the mystery of it. If this be true,

¹ *ζωοποιεῖς* corresponds with the Hiphil of *חַיָּה*, which means 'to keep alive,' as much as 'to make alive.'

² The expression *ἐν φυλακῇ* by no means necessarily signifies a place of punishment. It may mean a place of protection. It is simply *in ward, in guardianship*. The rendering of the Syriac, which from its antiquity is so important, is *ܕܡܝܬܐ*, in *Hades*. The following is its rendering of the whole passage: 'He was dead in body, but alive in Spirit: and He preached to those souls which were kept in Hades.'

when the blessed Soul of our crucified Redeemer went among the souls of those whom He had just redeemed, what can be more probable than that he should have ‘proclaimed’ (ἐκήρυξεν) to them that their redemption had been fully effected, that Satan had been conquered, that the great sacrifice had been offered up? If angels joy over one sinner that repenteth, may we not suppose Paradise filled with rapture, when the Soul of Jesus came among the souls of His redeemed, Himself the herald (κήρυξ) of His own victory?

This is the view propounded by Bp. Horsley in his admirable sermon on this text¹. It is perfectly unnecessary to suppose that the consequence of Christ’s preaching in Hades, or Paradise, was similar to His or His Apostles’ preaching on earth. Both indeed were preachings of glad tidings. But in this was the difference. Preaching on earth is to men, who need repentance, and whose repentance is acceptable. Preaching to the souls of the departed, was a mere proclaiming of blessedness to men who had already repented when on earth, and had no need of repentance after death, when it never comes, and could not avail, even if it did come.

The only difficulty, in this interpretation of this difficult passage, is in the fact that the preaching is specially said to have been addressed to those ‘who had once been disobedient in the days of Noah.’ That many who died in the flood, may yet have been saved from final damnation, seems highly probable, and has been the opinion of many learned divines. The flood was a great temporal judgment, and it follows not that ‘all who perished in the flood are to perish everlastingly in the lake of fire.’ But the real difficulty consists in the fact, that the proclamation of the finishing of the great work of salvation is represented by St. Peter as having been addressed to these antediluvian penitents, and no mention is made of the penitents of later ages, who are equally interested in the tidings.

¹ Vol. i. Serm. xx.

It must be confessed that this is a knot which cannot easily be untied. Yet should not this induce us to reject the literal and grammatical interpretation of the passage, and to fall back upon those forced glosses, which have been devised, in order to avoid, instead of fairly meeting and endeavouring to solve, an acknowledged difficulty. Bishop Horsley says that he thinks he has ‘observed, in some parts of Scripture, an anxiety, if the expression may be allowed, of the sacred writers, to convey distinct intimations that the antediluvian race is not uninterested in the redemption and the final retribution.’ It may be conceived too, he thinks, that those who perished in the most awful of God’s temporal judgments, would, more than any, need and look for the comfort of Christ’s presence, and that consolation which His preaching in the regions of the departed would afford ‘to those prisoners of hope.’ Whether or not, such ideas give any clue to the solution of this difficulty, it may be hard to say. But in Bishop Horsley’s own words, ‘Is any difficulty that may present itself to the human mind, upon the circumstances of that preaching, of sufficient weight to make the thing unfit to be believed upon the word of the Apostle?—or are we justified, if, for such difficulties, we abandon the plain sense of the Apostle’s words, and impose upon them another meaning, not easily adapted to the words, though more proportioned to the capacity of our own understanding,—especially when it is confirmed by other Scriptures that He went to that place? In that place He could not but find the souls that are in it in safe keeping; and in some way or other, it cannot but be supposed, He would hold conference with them; and a particular conference with one class might be the means, and certainly could be no obstruction to a general communication with all. If the clear assertions of Holy Writ are to be discredited on account of difficulties which may seem to the human mind to arise out of them, little will remain to be believed in revealed or even in what is called natural religion: we must immedi-

ately part with the doctrine of atonement—of gratuitous redemption—of justification by faith without the works of the law—of sanctification by the influence of the Holy Spirit; and we must part at once with the hope of the Resurrection¹.

¹ P. 436. The whole Sermon deserves careful attention, and should be compared with Bishop Middleton, on 1 Pet. iii. 18. It is to be lamented that Bishop Pearson, in his most learned and elaborate article on the Descent into Hell, should have written less lucidly than is his wont. In more passages than one, unless I greatly misunderstand him, he has contradicted himself. At one time he defines hell as the place of departed spirits, and makes our Lord's descent thither no more than a passing into the state of the dead. At another time he argues, as if hell meant the place of torment, and says that Christ went there to save us from going thither, for which he quotes Tertullian, who, however, mentions the opinion only to condemn it. See especially p. 251.

ARTICLE IV.

Of the Resurrection of Christ.

CHRIST did truly rise again from death, and took again His body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith He ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth, until He return to judge all men at the last day.

De Resurrectione Christi.

CHRISTUS vere a mortuis resurrexit, suumque corpus cum carne, ossibus, omnibusque ad integritatem humanæ naturæ pertinentibus recepit: cum quibus in cœlum ascendit, ibique residet, quoad, extremo die, ad judicandos homines reversurus sit.

SECTION I.

HISTORY.

THE subjects treated of in this Article may be divided as follows:

I. First, We must consider Christ's Resurrection with His human Body.

II. Secondly, His Ascension, and Session at God's Right Hand.

III. Thirdly, His Return to Judgment.

I—II. The first and second of these divisions may historically be considered together.

Christ's Resurrection forms a part of all the ancient Creeds, and is followed by the Ascension, Session, and Judgment, as in this Article.

The Sadducees, who denied all resurrection, of course would deny the resurrection of Christ. The Essenes also, though they believed the immortality of the soul, yet did not believe that

the body would rise. We find as early as apostolic times, that some heretics had crept into the Christian Church, who said that 'there was no resurrection of the dead' (1 Cor. xv. 12), and that 'the resurrection was past already' (2 Tim. ii. 18). Whoever these heretics may have been, not long after them the Docetæ, denying the reality of Christ's flesh, and holding the doctrine of the general malignity of matter, of necessity disbelieved the truth of the resurrection and ascension of Christ. Augustine tells us that the Cerinthians held that Jesus, whom they took to be a mere man, had not risen, but was yet to rise¹. Apelles, a disciple of Marcion's, held that when Christ came down from heaven, He formed for Himself as He descended an airy and sidereal flesh, but when He arose and ascended into Heaven He restored this body to its pristine elements, which being thus dispersed, His Spirit alone returned to Heaven².

Some of the earlier heretics, though otherwise connected with the Gnostics, did not absolutely deny either a body or a resurrection to Christ, but invented strange fables concerning it. Thus, according to Theodoret, Hermogenes believed our Lord's Body to be placed in the Sun³. And Tertullian mentions certain heretics who taught that 'that the flesh of Christ was in the heavens devoid of sense, as a scabbard or sheath, Christ being withdrawn from it⁴.' The Manichees, like the Gnostics or Docetæ, denying the reality of Christ's flesh, and

¹ Jesum hominem tantummodo fuisse, nec resurrexisse sed resurrecturum asseverantes.—August. *Hæres.* viii. Tom. viii. p. 7.

² Tertullian. *De Præscript. adv. Hær.* c. 33. *De Resurr. Carnis*, c. 5. Epiphan. *Hær.* xliv. August. *Hæres.* xiii. Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 272. Lardner, *Hist. of Heretics*, Book II. chap. xii. sect. x. King, *On Creed*, p. 261.

³ Theodoret. *Hæret. Fab.* Lib. i. c. 19. Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 273. King, p. 263.

Philaster and Augustine ascribe the same opinion to the followers of Seleucus and Hermias. See Lardner, *Hist. of Heretics*, Book II. ch. xviii. sect. viii.

⁴ Adfirmant carnem in coelis vacuum sensu, ut vaginam exempto Christo sedere. *De Carne Christi*, c. 24. Pearson, p. 272. King, p. 269.

believing matter to be evil, denied Christ's resurrection; but as they seem to have identified Christ with Mythras (æthereal Light, the Sun), there may have been some connexion between their belief and that of Hermogenes mentioned above¹. The doctrine of Eutyches concerning the Person of Christ, as it was opposed to the verity of His Manhood, so it by implication opposed the verity of His resurrection; and so Theodoret accuses him of considering that the Godhead only rose from the grave².

In later ages, when the controversies arose concerning the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, it has been thought that divines of the Roman and Lutheran communions were led to use language concerning the glorified Body of our blessed Lord, and its ubiquity, which almost savoured of Eutychianism; as though, after His ascension, His human nature had become so deified as to have lost the attributes of humanity, and have been transubstantiated into His Divinity. There is little doubt that the strong language of this Article was designed to oppose so exaggerated an opinion, if such really existed; which may be the better seen by comparing the words of the Article with the rubric at the end of the Communion Service³.

It is not to be concealed that in later times some persons,

¹ Μέχρι σήμερον Μανιχαῖοι λέγουσι φαντασιώδη καὶ οὐκ ἀληθῇ τοῦ Σωτῆρος τὴν ἀνάστασιν γεγονέναι. Cyril. Hierosol. Catech. xiv. Suicer, i. 311.

² Theodoret (*Hæret. Fab. Lib. iv. cap. xiii.*) says he asserted τὴν θεότητα τῷ τάφῳ παραδοθεῖσαν τετυχηκέναι τῆς ἀναστάσεως. See Suicer, Vol. i. p. 311.

³ The rubric, after explaining that by kneeling at the Communion no adoration is intended either to the "Sacramental Bread and Wine, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood," adds, "The natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one." This rubric was first inserted in the Second Service Book of Edward VI. It was omitted in the Prayer-Book in Elizabeth's reign, probably from a wish not to offend the many persons of Lutheran sentiments then in communion with the Church. It was restored in the last revision in the reign of Charles II., at the request of the Puritan Divines.

of very sound opinions in the main, have been offended by the statement, that our Lord took into Heaven ‘flesh, bones, and all things pertaining to man’s nature;’ whereas they contend, that our Lord’s Body at His ascension, if not before, became a spiritual body, and a spiritual body cannot be said to have ‘flesh and bones,’ which pertain only to a natural body. This objection must be considered hereafter; and in the meantime we have only to add that the language of the Article corresponds with that of the early Fathers. Ignatius says that ‘he knew and believed Him to be in the flesh after His resurrection¹.’ Irenæus, in one of his Creeds, confesses his belief in ‘the reception of Jesus Christ into Heaven in the flesh².’ In the Epistle of Damasus to Paulinus, the following anathema occurs amongst others, ‘If any one shall not acknowledge that Christ is set down at the right hand of the Father, in the same flesh which He took here, let him be anathema³.’ Augustine meets the objection which may be made to this doctrine: ‘It offends some,’ he says, ‘that we believe an earthly Body to have been taken into Heaven; they understand not how it is said in Scripture, It is sown a natural, it is raised a spiritual body⁴.’ To the like purpose writes Epiphanius: ‘He ascended into Heaven, not divesting Himself of His holy Body, but uniting it to a spiritual one⁵.’

¹ Εγὼ γὰρ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα καὶ πιστεύω ὄντα. *Epist. ad Smyrn.* c. 3. Pearson, p. 255. Suicer, l. p. 107.

² τὴν ἑνσαρκον εἰς τοὺς οὐράνους ἀνάληψιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. *Lib. I. c. 2.*

³ Theodoret, *Eccl. Hist.* *Lib. v. c. 11.* King, *On Creed*, p. 268.

⁴ Solet autem quosdam offendere quod credamus assumptum terrenum corpus in cœlum. Sed gentiles plerumque philosophorum argumentis nobiscum agere student, ut dicant terrenum aliquid in cœlo esse non posse. Nostras enim Scripturas non noverunt, nec sciunt quomodo dictum sit, *seminatur corpus animale, surgit corpus spiritale.* August. *de Fide et Symbola*, c. III. Tom. VI. p. 157.

⁵ Ἀνελθὼν εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐνδόξῃ, οὐκ ἀποθέμενος τὸ ἅγιον σῶμα, ἀλλὰ συνενώσας εἰς πνευματικόν. Anaceph. Tom. II. p. 156. Colon. King, p. 262.

The fathers indeed held that Christ's Body, after His resurrection, remained truly a human Body, and was not changed into a spirit, or absorbed into God¹. Yet they held that it was divested of all that was mortal, carnal, and corruptible, and became a spiritual Body, incorruptible, unchangeable, impassible. So Theophylact, 'Did He lay aside His flesh? God forbid; for as He was taken up, so shall He come. But He was taken up in the flesh, and with a Body. Now Christ is said to have lived after the flesh, when He lived subject to natural and blameless affections and feelings—hungering, thirsting, sleeping, working. But now He is no longer after the flesh, that is, He is freed from all such natural and blameless affections, having a Body impassible and incorruptible².'

III. The third head concerns our Lord's return to Judgment.

The Marcionites and other Gnostics are supposed to have denied a future Judgment. Their creed was that God was of infinite grace and mercy; that the Creator, whom they distinguished from God, was just; not so God, or His Son Jesus Christ. They were also accused of holding that the actions of

¹ Οὐκοῦν οὐκ εἰς θεότητος μετεβλήθη φύσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἀθάνατον μένει καὶ ἄφθαρτον, καὶ θειᾶς δοξῆς μεστόν. σῶμα δὲ ὁμῶς τὴν οἰκίαν ἔχον περιγραφὴν. Theodoret in *Demonstrationibus per Syllogismos*. Syllogism. IX.

Again: Οὐ μετεβλήθη εἰς πνεῦμα τὸ σῶμα· σὰρξ γὰρ ἦν καὶ ὀστέα, καὶ χεῖρες, καὶ πόδες· τοιγαροῦν καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν σῶμα μεμένηκε. Ibid. Syllog. x. See Suicer, l. p. 307.

² Theophyl. ad 2 Cor. v. 16.

Τὴν σαρκὰ ἀπέθετο; μὴ γένοιτο· ὡς γὰρ ἀνελήφθη, οὕτω καὶ ἐλεύσεται· ἀνελήφθη δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ μετὰ τοῦ σώματος ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς κατὰ σαρκὰ λέγεται ζῆσαι, ὅτε κατὰ τὰ φυσικὰ καὶ ἀδιάβλητα πάθη ἔζη, πεινῶν, διψῶν, ὑπνῶν, κοπιῶν· νῦν δὲ, οὐκέτι κατὰ σαρκὰ· τουτέστι, τῶν φυσικῶν τούτων καὶ ἀδιαβλήτων ἀπηλλάγη, ἀπαθὲς καὶ ἀκήρατον σῶμα ἔχων.

So Theodoret on the same passage: Εἰ γὰρ αὐτὸς δεσπότης Χριστὸς παθητὸν εἶχε τὸ σῶμα, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὸ πάθος ἄφθαρτον τοῦτο πεποίηκε καὶ ἀθάνατον. See Suicer as above.

men in the body were indifferent : and this tenet, by implication, is a denial of the Judgment¹. The Manichees are charged in like manner with denying a Judgment, as they, no doubt, did deny a resurrection of the body².

One of the peculiar views of Emmanuel Swedenborg in modern times, and of his followers, who call themselves the Church of the New Jerusalem, was that the passages of Scripture concerning the Judgment are not to be literally interpreted. Swedenborg taught that all men are subject to two opposite influences, one from God and good spirits, the other from evil angels ; that according as they yield to one or the other influence, the soul rises or falls. Heaven and hell then are not the result of a Divine appointment, or of a future Judgment, but the necessary conditions of a man according as he is good or evil. The passages of Scripture concerning the last Judgment are to be understood of the end and consummation of the Church which now is, and the establishment of a purer and better Church, which is called the descent 'of the New Jerusalem from God out of Heaven.'

¹ See King, *On the Creed*, p. 274.

² Hey's *Lectures*, Vol. II. p. 390 ; and Lardner as referred to there.

SECTION II.

SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

I. **A**S regards the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, it requires very little argument to prove that Scripture teaches the *fact*. The truth of such teaching must be here, as usual, assumed; all argument on such subjects being referred to the head of evidence.

The concluding chapters of the four Gospels, and the fifteenth Chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, contain the fullest account of that miraculous event. They should be studied together, and with such aids as have been furnished by writers on the harmony of the Gospels¹.

It is to be observed, however, that the Resurrection is in many respects the keystone of the Christian Faith. On the truth of it depends the truth of the Gospel; for it was to this great fact especially that the Apostles bore witness, and on its veracity they rested their claims to be heard and believed. Our Lord Himself continually foretold it, and so its occurrence became essential to the establishment of His truth. Accordingly we find, both before and after the event, most numerous allusions to it in the writing of the new Testament. For example, Matt. xvii. 9, 23. Mark viii. 31; ix. 31. John ii. 19; x. 17, 18. Acts i. 22; ii. 24, 36; xiii. 3—37. Rom. iv. 25; vi. 4. Eph. i. 20. Col. ii. 12; iii. 1, &c. &c.

Yet the historical is scarcely greater than the doctrinal importance of the Resurrection. In Scripture, the life of the Christian, and of the Christian Church, is represented as connected with, and depending on the life of Christ, who is the

¹ Those most approved of in our own language are Lightfoot, Mac-knight, Greswell, &c. Greswell's *Harmonia Evangelica*, and his five volumes of *Dissertations* on the subject, should be in every student's library.

Head of the Church and the Saviour of the Body¹. The Christian therefore is said to die with Christ, and to rise again with Him². And this connexion of the Redeemer and His redeemed, is both spiritual here, and bodily and spiritual both hereafter. For here the union of the Christian with Christ is the cause of spiritual life; hereafter the same union shall be the cause of resurrection to life eternal. The Apostle speaks of the power of Christ's resurrection as having been shewn already, thus: 'God who is rich in mercy...when we were dead in trespasses and sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, and hath raised us up together, and made us to sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus,' Eph. ii. 4, 5, 6; and again: 'If ye be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above,' Col. iii. 1. But he also speaks of the power of the same resurrection, as to be shewn hereafter, not only in raising the soul from sin, but the body also from corruption. 'If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit which dwelleth in you,' Rom. viii. 11. And again, 'He which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also by Jesus,' 2 Cor. iv. 14. And thus it is that by virtue of His own resurrection, or, as St. Paul calls it, 'the power of His resurrection' (Phil. iii. 10), the Lord Jesus is to His disciples 'the Resurrection and the Life' (John xi. 25).

II. The second head of this article concerns the Ascension, and Session at God's Right Hand.

1 The Ascension into Heaven is related in Mark xvi. 19. Luke xxiv. 51. Acts i. 1—12.

It had been predicted in the old Testament (especially

¹ John xv. 1—7; xvii. 23. Rom. xii. 5. 1 Cor. vi. 15; xii. 27. Eph. i. 22, 23; iv. 15, 16; v. 23. Col. i. 18, &c.

² Rom. vi. 8. Eph. ii. 5, 6. Col. ii. 12; iii. 1. 1 Pet. i. 3. 2 Cor. iv. 10, 11, 14. Rom. viii. 11. 1 Cor. vi. 14, &c.

Ps. lxviii. 18, which is explained by the Apostle Eph. iv. 8); it had been foretold by our Lord Himself (John vi. 62; xx. 17); and it finally took place in the presence of His chosen disciples.

The importance of it to us was typified on the great day of atonement, when the High Priest entered into the Holy of Holies once every year. The tabernacle, as is familiarly known, consisted of two principal parts. The first was called the Sanctuary or holy place, which typified the world, or more properly the Church on earth; where daily the priesthood ministered, offering sacrifices for the people, and sending up incense, the symbol of prayer and praise. But within the veil, whither no common priest had access, was the Holy of Holies, or the Holiest of all. Into this, once every year, on the tenth day of Tizri, the Fast, or day of atonement, the High Priest alone entered. He had made atonement for himself, for the sanctuary, and for the people, by sacrificing a bullock, a ram and a goat; and dressed in the white robes common to the priesthood, he went with the blood of the victims into the most holy place, and sprinkled seven times before the mercy-seat the blood of the bullock and the goat (Levit. xvi.). That this all prefigured the entrance of Christ 'into Heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us,' we have the word of the Apostle in the ninth chapter of the Hebrews. As the High Priest was in the common white garments, not in the gorgeous robe of his high priesthood, so Christ went up in the likeness of sinful humanity, carrying our nature with Him, though pure from the sin of humanity, as the garment of the priest was holy and white (Lev. xvi. 4). As the priest took with him the blood of the sacrifice, so Christ offered His own Blood, and before the mercy-seat of God pleaded, and for ever pleads, the merits of His Sacrifice, 'seeing that He ever liveth to make intercession for us¹.'

¹ Heb. viii. ix. x. *passim*.

2 The Session at the Right Hand of God, foretold Ps. cx. 1 (comp. Luke xx. 42), and by our Lord, Matth. xxv. 64. Mark xvi. 62. Luke xxii. 69, is recorded, Mark xvi. 19. Acts ii. 34. Rom. viii. 34. Eph. i. 20. Col. iii. 1. Heb. i. 3, 13. 1 Pet. iii. 12. It is hardly necessary to observe that, when the Scriptures speak of the Right Hand of God, they mean thereby not that God has hands like a man, but that as the right hand among men is the place of honour, of power, and of joy¹, so to be by the Right Hand of God is to have the place of highest glory, power, and pleasure in the presence of God in Heaven; and *to sit* has no reference to posture, but implies dignity, sovereignty and judgment.

Christ has ascended into Heaven, and there He abides. He now occupies that Mediatorial throne, where He is to sit till all enemies be made His footstool (Ps. cx. 1. 1 Cor. xv. 25). He had been anointed to His kingly office when the Holy Ghost descended on Him at His baptism (Matt. iii. Acts x. 38). He vindicated His title to the throne, when 'by death He overcame him who had the power of death, even the devil.' He made a farther advance to the assumption of His dominion, when he rose victorious from the grave, and thereupon declared to His disciples, that 'all power was given Him in Heaven and earth' (Matt. xxviii. 11). But it was not until His final exaltation, when God having 'raised Him from the dead, set Him at His own Right Hand in heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come,' that 'all things having been put under His feet,' He was 'given to be Head over all things to the Church' (Eph. i. 20, 21, 22); set upon the throne of His father David' (Luke i. 32); and 'there was given to Him dominion and glory and a kingdom,' 'an everlasting dominion which shall not pass

¹ 1 Kings ii. 11. Matt. xxvi. 64. Ps. xvi. 11.

away, and a kingdom, which shall not be destroyed' (Dan. vii. 14).

3 The next point for our consideration is, that Christ is said 'to have taken again His Body, with flesh, bones, and all things belonging to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith He ascended into Heaven.'

It has been seen, in the former Section, what the fathers appear to have taught on this subject. That our Lord arose from the grave in the same Body in which He was buried; that the same Body, with flesh and bones, which was laid in the sepulchre a lifeless corpse, was re-animated and rose again to life on the third day, is plainly and unquestionably the statement of the Evangelists. It was on this fact that their preaching and their faith rested. It was the assurance of this fact that convinced St. Thomas of the Divinity of Christ. He had declared that he would not believe the resurrection, until he had seen in our Lord's hands the print of the nails, and had thrust his hand into His side (John xx. 25). That is to say, he required proof that our Lord's Body, which had risen, was the same Body which had been crucified; and when our Lord vouchsafed him this proof, then, and not till then, he exclaimed 'My Lord and my God!' (John xx. 25—28).

But farther, when, on one occasion, the disciples were assembled, and our Lord suddenly appeared amongst them, 'they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit, but He said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have. And when He had thus spoken, He shewed them His hands and His feet' (Luke xxiv. 36—40). Thus it is clear, that our Lord's Body after He rose from the grave, was that Body in which He was buried, having hands and feet, and flesh and bones, capable of being handled, and in which He spoke and ate and

drank (Luke xxiv. 42, 43). Moreover, it appears that our Lord thus shewed His hands and feet to His disciples at that very interview with them in which He was parted from them, and received up into Heaven. This will be seen by reading the last chapter of St. Luke from verse 36 to the end, and comparing it with the first chapter of the Acts, ver. 4—9; especially comparing Luke xxiv. 49, 50, with Acts i. 4, 8, 9. In that Body then, which the disciples felt and handled, and which was proved to them to have flesh and bones, these disciples saw our Lord ascend into Heaven: and immediately after His ascent, angels came and declared to them, that that 'same Jesus, whom they had seen taken up into Heaven, should so come in like manner as they had seen Him go into Heaven' (Acts i. 11). All this connected together seems to prove the identity of our Lord's Body after His resurrection, at His ascension, and so on, even till His coming to Judgment, with the Body in which He suffered, and in which He was buried; and so fully justifies the language used in the Article of our Church.

But because we maintain that the Body of Christ, even after His resurrection and ascension, is a true human Body, with all things pertaining to the perfection of man's nature (to deny which would be to deny the important truth, that Christ is still perfect Man as well as perfect God,) it by no means therefore follows, that we should deny that His risen Body is now a glorified, and as St. Paul calls it, a *spiritual* Body. Nay! we have the strongest proofs that so it is.

Even before His ascension, He is said to have come and stood in the midst of His disciples, where the doors were shut for fear of the Jews (John xx. 19). On another occasion, He is said to have vanished out of their sight (Luke xxiv. 31). Again, His appearing to them 'in another form' (Mark xvi. 12), and the disciples going to Emmaus not at once knowing Him (Luke xxiv. 16), seem to shew that there was some change in

the appearance, as well as in the properties of His Body. Though His Body had not ceased to be the same Body which it was before His death, it yet appears to have received some degree of glorification, and to have been invested with some supernatural qualities.

But, after His ascension, we have St. Paul's distinct assurance, that the Body of Christ is a glorious, is a spiritual Body. In 1 Cor. xv. we have St. Paul's assertion, that in the resurrection of all men, the body shall rise again, but that it shall no longer be a natural body, but a spiritual body; no longer a corruptible and vile, but an incorruptible and glorious body. 'It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body.' 'Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Behold, I shew you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed.' 'For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality' (1 Cor. xv. 42—53). And this change of our bodies, from natural to spiritual, is expressly stated to be bearing the image of our glorified Lord—the image of that heavenly Man, the Lord from Heaven (vv. 47—49).

So again, the glorified state of the saints' bodies after the Resurrection, which in 1 Cor. xv. had been called the receiving a spiritual body, is, in Phil. iii. 21, said to be a fashioning of their bodies to the likeness of Christ's glorious Body; 'who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious Body¹.'

¹ Non ita dictum est, quasi corpus vertatur in spiritum, et spiritus fiat: quia et nunc corpus nostrum quod animale dicitur, non in animam verum est et anima factum. Sed spiritale corpus intelligitur, quod ita spiritui subditum est, ut cœlesti habitationi conveniat, omni fragilitate ac labe terrena in cœlestem puritatem et stabilitatem mutata atque conversa. August. *De Fide et Symbolo*, c. vi. Tom. vi. p. 157.

We must therefore conclude, that though Christ rose with the same Body in which He died, and that Body neither did, nor shall cease to be a human Body, still it acquired, either at His Resurrection or at His Ascension, the qualities and attributes of a spiritual, as distinguished by the Apostle from a natural body, of an incorruptible, as distinguished from a corruptible body.

It is not perhaps given us to know the exact meaning of the term 'a spiritual body.' 'We know not yet what we shall be;' and so we do not exactly know what He is whom we shall be like. It may be better to leave in the obscurity, in which Scripture has left it, this great and glorious mystery. And we shall err on neither side, if we maintain that our blessed Saviour still continues our Mediator in Heaven, perfect in His nature of God, and perfect in His nature of Man; but with His human nature, which on earth, though sinless, was mortal and corruptible, now raised to glory and immortality and incorruptibility; His natural having become a spiritual, His corruptible an incorruptible Body¹.

III. The third head of the Article is on the Judgment; in which we may consider,

¹ There may be a difficulty in reconciling this doctrine, which is the plain doctrine of Scripture and the primitive Christians, with the language of the rubric at the end of the Communion Service quoted above. If they be at variance, the language of a not very carefully-worded rubric, adopted not without some hesitation by the Reformers, ought not to be pressed: but it is plain that the writers of the rubric did not mean by the words 'natural body' to convey the same idea as St. Paul attaches to the term in 1 Cor. xv. The doctrine which they meant to teach was only that we must not consider the manhood of Christ changed into His Godhead. So St. Augustine: *Noli itaque dubitare ibi nunc esse hominem Christum Jesum unde venturus est in eadem carnis forma et substantia; cui profecto immortalitatem dedit, naturam non abstulit. Secundum hanc formam non putandus est ubique diffusus. Cavendum est enim, ne ita divinitatem adstruamus hominis, ut veritatem corporis auferamus.* *Ad Dard. Epist.* 187. Tom. II. p. 681.

- 1 The Agent or Person who shall judge, Christ.
- 2 The object to be judged, viz. all men.
- 3 The action, judgment.
- 4 The time, the last day.

1 As regards the Agent; it is, in the first place clear that *God* shall be 'the Judge of all the earth' (Gen xviii. 25. Ps. lviii. 11). Hence the day of Judgment is called 'the day of God' (2 Pet. iii. 12)—'the great day of Almighty God' (Rev. xvi. 14). Daniel saw 'the thrones cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit' (Dan. vii. 9); and St. John saw 'the dead great and small stand before God,' for judgment (Rev. xx. 12).

Now when God is thus generally spoken of, we must either understand God the Father, or the whole blessed Trinity. And in the general, it is true to say, that God shall judge the earth, or, that God the Father shall judge the earth. But then, as God made the worlds, but it was by God the Son; as God hath purchased the Church, but it was by the death of His Son; so the Father Himself judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son' (John v. 22). 'He hath given Him authority to execute judgment, because He is the Son of Man' (John v. 27): 'He hath appointed a day in the which He will judge the world in righteousness by that Man whom He hath ordained' (Acts xvii. 31): 'He will judge the secrets of all men by Jesus Christ' (Rom. ii. 16).

Accordingly, the Judgment, when fully described, is ever represented as the coming of the Lord Jesus. It is called the 'day of Christ' (2 Thess. ii. 2). 'We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ' (2 Cor. v. 10). 'The Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father, with His angels' (Matt. xvi. 27; xxiv. 37; xxv. 31; xxvi. 64). The 'same Jesus, which was taken up into Heaven, shall come again in like manner as He went into Heaven' (Acts i. 11). 'He has been ordained of God to be Judge of quick and dead' (Acts x. 42).

He says of Himself. 'Behold ! I come quickly, and My reward is with Me' (Rev. xxii. 12).

2 The objects of the Judgment are all men, whether those living at the time of Christ's coming, or those already fallen asleep—'the quick and the dead.'

In the first Epistle to the Thessalonians (iv. 15—17), the Apostle describes the awful scene of our Lord's coming to save His people : 'The Lord Himself shall descend from Heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel and the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we which are alive and remain' (i. e. whoever of Christ's servants may then remain alive on the earth) 'shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air.' In the like manner, he says (1 Cor. xv. 51, 52), 'we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump. For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.' Accordingly it is said (2 Tim. iv. 1), that 'the Lord Jesus Christ shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing :' that He 'was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead' (Acts x. 42. Compare Matt. xxv. throughout, John v. 25, 28, &c).

3 The Judgment itself, which is the action the great Judge is to perform, is fully described in several of the passages already quoted or referred to. The twenty-fifth chapter of St. Matthew especially, under a variety of images, sets forth the terrors of the great day of the Lord :—the ten virgins that meet the Bridegroom—the servants with their various talents—the Lord with all nations brought before Him, dividing them as a Shepherd the sheep from the goats.

In all these passages, and many besides, it is expressly said that the Judgment itself shall be '*according to works.*' On this subject the following references may be consulted, and will be

found full and express. Job xxxiv. 11. Ps. xxii. 12. Prov. xxiv. 12. Jer. xvii. 10; xxii. 19. Matt. xvi. 27; xxv. 31—46. John v. 29. Rom. ii. 6. 2 Cor. v. 10. Col. iii. 24, 25. Rev. xx. 12; xxii. 12.

It need only be added, that Judgment according to works is a doctrine of Scripture not opposed to justification by faith. That we cannot be justified by the merits of our own works, is a plain statement of St. Paul (Rom. iii. 20; viii. 3. Gal. ii. 16. Eph. ii. 9, &c.). But if we be renewed by the Spirit of God, and transformed in the spirit of our minds; if Christ be in us, and the Spirit of God dwell in our hearts; then, being dead to sin, we can no longer live therein (Rom. vi. 2). Sin will not reign in our mortal bodies (Rom. vi. 12); but ‘the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus will have made us free from that law of sin’ (Rom. viii. 2), which would naturally reign in us; and so ‘the righteousness of the Law will be fulfilled in all, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit’ (Rom. viii. 4). We are specially warned not to be deceived on this head; for ‘he that doeth righteousness is righteous,’ and ‘he who committeth sin is of the devil.’ ‘He that doeth not righteousness is not of God’ (1 John iii. 7—10). Thus then the mark of distinction between the children of God and the children of the devil is this—that righteousness is practised by the one party, sin by the other. And hence it is but likely that Judgment, which is to distinguish Christ’s servants from His enemies, should be conducted according to the works of every man, which shall ‘be brought to light, whether they be good or evil.’ The just indeed shall be rewarded, not because of the merit of their works, but because of the atonement and righteousness of Christ. Yet still their own good works will be the test of their sanctification, and the proof before men and angels, that they are living members of Christ and regenerated by His Spirit; whereas the wicked works of wicked men will justly consign them to death and damnation.

4 It remains but to speak of the time of Christ's coming to Judgment—the last day.

The general descriptions of the Judgment already referred to (*e.g.* Matt. xxv. Rev. xx. 11—13, &c.), sufficiently shew that it will not take place until the time when all present things shall pass away. All mankind, quick and dead, are represented as brought before the judgment-seat, and the just are sent to an everlasting reward, the wicked to an everlasting punishment. Accordingly, St. Paul says, it shall be 'at the last trump' (1 Cor. xv. 52), and St. Peter represents 'the heavens and the earth, which now are' as 'reserved unto fire against the day of Judgment.' The heavens shall be dissolved, and the elements shall 'melt with fervent heat;' yet there shall be for the redeemed 'a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness' (2 Pet. iii. 7—13).

But though the time is thus accurately marked, as 'the last day,' the close and consummation of the present state of things, yet we are continually told, that it is utterly impossible for us to know how soon that day may come, or how long it may tarry. It was not for our Lord's most favoured disciples, 'to know the times and the seasons, which the Father hath put in His own power' (Acts i. 7). They and we are bid to 'watch, for we know not what hour our Lord cometh' (Matt. xxiv. 42: compare also Matt. xxv. 13. Mark xiii. 33. Luke xii. 40. 2 Pet. iii. 9, 10). The disciples were taught to be constantly expecting our Lord; and accordingly they spoke and wrote as though they thought that He might come at any time. (See Rom. xiii. 11. Phil. iv. 5. 1 Thess. iv. 15, 17. Heb. x. 25. James v. 7, 8, &c.). Yet still they were fully aware that He might delay His coming they knew not how long; and the importance of this uncertainty St. Paul earnestly impresses on the Thessalonians (2 Thess. ii. 1—3); and St. Peter still more fully inculcates on all men (2 Pet. iii. 4. 8—10).

There is one passage, however, especially remarkable on this subject. After our Lord had foretold the destruction of Jerusalem, and assured His disciples, that the generation then alive should not pass away till that His prediction was accomplished (Matt. xxiv. 34. Mark xiii. 30); He goes on to tell them, that though He thus gave them to know the time when He would execute His judgment on Jerusalem, yet the day of His final Judgment, (which they had confounded with the destruction of Jerusalem, Matt. xxiv. 36,) was unknown to men and angels. Nay, according to the record of St. Mark, our Lord said, ‘Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in Heaven, *neither the Son*, but My Father only’ (Mark xiii. 32).

It has been seen that, in His human nature, our Lord was capable of knowledge and of ignorance. He was perfect Man, as well as perfect God, and He grew in wisdom as well as in stature (Luke ii. 52). In that nature then, in which He was capable of ignorance, He, when He was on earth, knew not the coming of the day of God. Though He is Himself to come, yet as Man He knew not the day of His own coming. This is indeed a great mystery, that that Manhood, which is taken into one Person with the Godhead of the Son, should be capable of not knowing everything, seeing that God the Son is omniscient. But it is scarcely more inexplicable, than that God the Son in His Manhood, should be weak, passible, and mortal, who, in His Godhead, is omnipotent, impassible, and immortal¹. If we believe the one, we can admit the other.

¹ The explanation of Mark xiii. 32, given in the text, is both consonant with sound principles of interpretation and with sound theology, and has been the explanation of the most ancient Christian fathers.

Ἀνθρωπίνως τοῦτο εἶρηκε· καὶ τὸ αἷτιον τοῦ οὕτως εἰρηκέναι ἔχει τὸ εὐλογον, ἐπειδὴν γὰρ ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν, ἀνθρώπων δὲ ἴδιον τὸ ἀγνοεῖν, ὥσπερ τὸ πεινᾶν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὴν ἀγνοίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὡς ἄνθρωπος γεγωνὼς ἐπιδείκνυται, ἵνα δείξῃ ὅτι ἀληθῶς ἀνθρώπινον ἔχει σῶμα. Athanas. *Epist. ad Serapion*. Tom. i. p. 172. See Suicer, s. v. κρίσις. v. 4, 6.

ARTICLE V.

Of the Holy Ghost.

THE Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.

De Spiritu Sancto.

SPIRITUS Sanctus, a Patre et Filio procedens, ejusdem est cum Patre et Filio essentiæ, majestatis et gloriæ, verus et æternus Deus.

SECTION I.

HISTORY.

THE subjects of this Article to be treated on are

- | | |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| I. The Divinity | } of the Holy Ghost. |
| II. The Personality | |
| III. The Procession | |

Those early heretics, who denied the Divinity of the Son of God, seem generally to have disbelieved the Personality of the Holy Spirit, and to have looked on Him not as a Person, but as an efficacy, power, or emanation from God.

This heresy appears to have been as early as Simon Magus himself, and his immediate followers the Gnostics. The like opinion would of course naturally prevail among those speculators who afterwards acquired the name of Sabellians, such as Arius, Noetus, Sabellius, Berytus, Paulus Samosatenus¹.

The Arians, on the contrary, appear to have taught that the

¹ the account of these heretics, Art. i. § 1.; and the authorities to in the notes. See also Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. viii. p. 322, *ibid.*, Vol. ii. p. 774.

Spirit was a separate Person from the Father and the Son, but that He was, as they held the Son to be, but a creature. Nay, as they held the Son to be a creature created by the Father, so they are said to have taught that the Spirit was created by the Son, and hence called Him *κτίσμα κτίσματος*, the creature of a creature¹. Macedonius especially was considered the head of the Pneumatomachi, or impugners of the Divinity of the Spirit, being reckoned, among the semi-Arians, orthodox about the Person of the Son, but a believer in the creation of the Holy Ghost. He is said to have called the Holy Spirit the servant or minister of God². This heresy of Macedonius was condemned by the second general council, held at Constantinople, A.D. 381, which added to the Nicene Creed the words, 'And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets.'

Of the fathers, Origen and Lactantius have been charged with unsound doctrines concerning the Holy Ghost.

It is not easy to arrive at a just conclusion concerning the statements of Origen, owing to the fierce disputes which arose concerning them, the obscurity, and the mutilated condition of his writings. He has been accused of questioning whether as 'all things were made by' the Son, so the Holy Spirit may have been included in 'all things,' and therefore created by the Son. The accusation however appears to be unjust, and to have been grounded on some inaccuracy of language and obscurity of reasoning, not on any really heretical statements³.

¹ Τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα κτίσμα κτίσματος φάσιν εἶναι. Epiphani. *Hær.* LXIX. 56, p. 778, Colon.; Suicer, II. p. 775. A synod, held under Damasus at Rome, decreed εἰ τις εἴποι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ποιῆμα ἢ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ γεννηθῆναι ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. Apud Theodor. I. v. c. 11. See Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 316, note. Suicer, as above; and the account given, Art. I. § I. See also Lardner's *Works*, Vol. IV. pp. 113, 114.

² Suicer, II. p. 774.

³ The book in which Origen is especially accused of having spoken

Jerom more than once charges Lactantius with virtually denying the Personality of the Holy Spirit, by referring His operation, through a Jewish error, to the Person of the Father or of the Son¹; an heretical belief which he says prevailed among many.

One of the strange forms which heresy is said to have assumed, was that which is attributed to Montanus, viz. that he gave himself out to be the Paraclete, *i. e.* the Spirit of God. Nay, it is even said that he had his disciples baptized in his own name, as the third Person of the blessed Trinity²; though it appears to be doubtful whether Montanus really meant that

blasphemy concerning the Spirit of God, is the first book of the *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν* (*De Principiis*), ἐν ᾧ πλείστα βλασφημεῖ, τὸν μὲν Υἱὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς πεποιῆσθαι λέγων, τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα ὑπὸ τοῦ Υἱοῦ. Photius, *Biblioth. cod. viij.* We have this book only in the translation of Ruffinus, who in his prologue to it says that he has omitted parts of the book which had been foisted into it by heretics, and supplied the omissions from other portions of the genuine works of Origen. Jerom (*Lib. i. adv. Ruffinum*) accuses Ruffinus of having mistranslated Origen, and he himself undertook to give a new translation. All but fragments of the latter are lost. If Ruffinus has given at all a fair representation of his author, the following would shew that Origen cannot have been very heretical concerning the Holy Ghost: *Ne quis sane existimet nos ex eo quod diximus Spiritum Sanctum solis sanctis præstari, Patris vero et Filii beneficia vel inoperationes pervenire ad bonos et malos, justos et injustos, prætulisse per hoc Patri et Filio Spiritum Sanctum, vel majorem ejus per hoc asserere dignitatem: quod utique valde inconsequens est. Proprietatem namque gratiæ ejus operisque descripsimus. Porro autem nihil in Trinitate majus minusve dicendum est, quum unius Divinitatis Fons Verbo ac Ratione sua teneat universa, Spiritu vero oris sui quæ digna sunt sanctificatione sanctificet, sicut in Psalmo scriptum est Verbo Domini cæli firmati sunt et Spiritu Oris Ejus omnis virtus eorum.* Origen. *De Principiis*, Lib. i. cap. 3. num. 7. Comp. num. 2.

¹ Hoc ideo quia multi per imperitiam Scripturarum, quod et Firmilianus in octavo ad Demetrianum epistolarum libro facit, asserunt Spiritum Sanctum sæpe Patrem sæpe Filium nominari; et cum perspicue in Trinitate credamus, tertiam Personam auferentes non substantiam Ejus esse volunt, sed nomen.—Hieron. in *Epist. ad Galatas*, cap. iv. Tom. vi. p. 311. Paris. 1602. See also Lardner, Vol. iv. p. 60.

² See Bingham, *E. A.* Book xi. ch. iii. § 7.

he was an incarnation of the Spirit, or only that the Spirit dwelt more fully in him than in any former man¹. Indeed, to some it appears that the Montanists were in their creed Sabellians, and that they thought that the Spirit which animated Montanus was but an emanation from God².

A denial of the Personality of the Holy Ghost, and a belief that He was but an influence or energy, seem to have been general in later times with the Socinians, and may be considered as a necessary consequence of a denial of the doctrine of the Trinity in general.

But the most celebrated controversy which has ever arisen concerning the Holy Ghost, was that which had reference to His Procession, and which led to the famous schism between the Eastern and Western churches.

The Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381) had inserted in the Creed of the Council of Nice (A.D. 325) the words ‘proceeding from the Father’ (τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον); and the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431) had decreed that no addition should be made to that Creed thenceforth. Accordingly the Greek fathers uniformly declared their belief in the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father.

The Latin Fathers, on the other hand, having regard to those passages of Scripture which speak of the Spirit of Christ, and of the Spirit as sent by the Son, continually spoke of the Holy Ghost as proceeding from the Father and the Son³. The

¹ Mosheim, Cent. II. Pt. II. ch. v. § 23; also, *De Rebus ante Constantinum M.* Sec. II. § 67; Bp. Kaye’s *Tertullian*, 2nd Edit. p. 22; Lardner’s *Heretics*, Book II. ch. 19.

Manes, Mohammed, and others beside them, have professed to be the Paraclete promised by Christ to His disciples. Whether by the Paraclete they meant the Holy Ghost, is questionable.

² See Bingham, as above.

³ Spiritus quoque Sanctus cum procedit a Patre et Filio, non separatur a Patre, non separatur a Filio.—Ambros. *De Sp. S.* c. x. Non possumus dicere quod Spiritus Sanctus et a Filio non procedat, neque enim frustra Spiritus et Patris et Filii Spiritus dicitur.—August. *De Trin.*

Greek fathers indeed were willing to use language approximating to the words of the Latin Fathers, but shrank from directly asserting the procession from the Son. Thus they spoke of the Holy Ghost as ‘the Spirit of Christ, proceeding from the Father, and receiving of the Son¹.’ And it has been inferred that many of the earlier Greek writers held, as did the Latins, a real procession from both the Father and the Son, although they were not willing to express themselves otherwise than in the words of the Creed.

Theodoret, in the fifth century, appears to have been the first of the Greeks who brought the question out into bold relief; for taking offence at some expressions of Cyril, who speaking of the Spirit had used the words ἴδιον τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, he declares that, if by such an expression he meant ‘that the Spirit derived His Being either from or through the Son, then the saying was to be rejected as blasphemous and profane; for we believe the Lord when He saith, “the Spirit which proceedeth from the Father,” and we believe St. Paul in like manner saying “we have not received the Spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God².’” St. Cyril, not directly replying to Theodoret, at least not entering fully upon

Lib. iv. cap. 20. See Pearson, p. 324, note. St. Augustine, more clearly and fully than any before him, asserted the procession from the Son. Hence the modern Greeks charge him with having invented it. See Waterland, *Works*, Vol. iv. p. 246. Oxf. 1823.

¹ Πνεῦσα Χριστοῦ, Πνεῦμα Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λάμβανον. Epiphanius. *Hæres.* LXIX. Tom. i. p. 788. Colon. 1682. See Suicer, i. 1070; Pearson, p. 324, note. Similar or stronger language used on this subject may be seen in the following: Εἰ τοίνυν παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ, φησι ὁ Κύριος, λήψεται, ὃν τρόπον οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν Πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ Υἱός, οὐδὲ τὸν Υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ Πατήρ· οὕτως τολμῶσι λέγειν (ἢ τολμῶ συλλέγειν) οὐδὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα εἰ μὴ ὁ Υἱός ἐξ οὗ λαμβάνει, καὶ ὁ Πατήρ ἐξ οὗ ἐκπορεύεται. Epiphanius. *Hæres.* LXXIV. 10, Tom. i. p. 898. Colon.—ζωὴ δὲ ὅλος ὁ Θεός, οὐκοῦν ζωὴ ἐκ ζωῆς ὁ Υἱός, ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωὴ, τὸ δὲ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα παρ’ ἀμφοτέρων, Πνεῦμα ἐκ Πνεύματος. *Hæres.* LXXIV. 7, Tom. i. p. 895.

² Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 325, note; Suicer, i. 1070.

the doctrine of the Procession, there appears to have been little controversy about it in the East, until attention was roused to the subject by the conduct of some portions of the Western Church. The question having been for some time discussed, whether or not the Spirit proceeded from the Son as well as from the Father, the Churches of France and Spain not only asserted such to be the case, but actually added to the Creed of Constantinople the words *Filioque* ('and the Son'), and so chanted the Creed in their Liturgies with the clause, *Credimus et in Spiritum Sanctum Dominum et vivificantem, ex Patre Filioque procedentem*¹. In the early part of the ninth century Pope Leo III. was appealed to, and decreed in a Synod held at Aquisgranum, that no such addition ought to be made to the creeds of the Church. Nay, so important did he esteem a strict adherence to the symbols in their original form, that he caused the Constantinopolitan Creed, in the very words in which it had been penned at the council, to be graven on silver plates, both in Latin and Greek, and so to be publicly set forth in the Church².

Afterwards, however, Pope Nicolas the First had a violent controversy with Photius, patriarch of Constantinople. Ignatius, who had been deposed from that see, and succeeded by Photius, appealed to Pope Nicolas, who took the part of Ignatius, and excommunicated Photius; who in his turn assembled a council at Constantinople, in 866, and excommunicated

¹ In very early Latin Councils this addition of the *Filioque* is made: as in the first Council of Bracara, A.D. 411, and in the third Council of Toledo, A.D. 589, where the Constantinopolitan Creed is recited. (Bingham, Bk. x. ch. iv. § 16.) The Council of Toledo was that which first ordered the Constantinopolitan Creed to be used in the Liturgy of the Spanish Church. (Bingham, *ibid.* § 7.) With regard to the insertion of the words *Filioque* in the Confession of the Council of Bracara, it now appears that they are not genuine, but foisted into it in later times. See Waterland, *Hist. of Athan. Creed, Works*, Vol. iv. p. 133, note.

² Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 325; Mosheim, Cent. ix. Pt. ii. ch. iii. § 18.

Nicolas. Subsequently, Ignatius, having been recalled by Basilus the Macedonian, and Photius degraded, a council was held at Constantinople (A.D. 869), which is called by the Latins the eighth Œcumenical Council, in which the controversies between the Eastern and Western Churches were hushed for the time. Among the subjects, which had been introduced into this unhappy discussion, the most prominent was the question concerning the Procession of the Holy Ghost; Photius charging the Latins with having adulterated the Creed of Constantinople by the addition of *Filioque*, and the Latins vigorously defending themselves concerning this and other charges¹.

On the death of Ignatius, A.D. 878, Photius was again restored to the patriarchal see, when John the Eighth was bishop of Rome. On his accession he again renewed the controversies with the West; and in a council held at Constantinople, A.D. 879 (owned by the Greeks as the eighth Œcumenical), it was declared that the addition of *Filioque* should be taken away. Leo the Philosopher afterwards again deposed Photius, and confined him in an Armenian convent, where he died in the year 891.²

The contest between the Churches, now suspended for a time, was revived in the year 1053, by Michael Cerularius, patriarch of Constantinople. Between him and Leo IX., bishop of Rome, a violent contest arose, both on the subject of their respective jurisdictions, and concerning the doctrines in dispute between the two great branches of the Church. Cerularius wrote, in his own name and that of Leo bishop of Achrida, a strong letter to John bishop of Trani in Apulia, charging the Latins with various errors. Leo therefore summoned a council at Rome, and excommunicated the Greek Churches. Constan-

¹ The famous Ratramn, whose book on the Eucharist exercised so important an influence on the English Reformation, was a principal champion of the Latins in this dispute.

² Mosheim, Cent. ix. Part II. ch. III. § 27—32; Pearson, as above.

tine Monomachus the emperor in vain strove to quench the flame of discord ; and though legates were sent from Rome to Constantinople, instead of endeavouring to allay the strife, they solemnly excommunicated Cerularius, Leo of Achrida, and their adherents, who, in their turn, in a public council excommunicated them¹. Thus arose the schism between the Eastern and Western Churches, which has never since been healed.

¹ Mosheim, Cent. xi. Part ii. chap. iii. § 9—11.

SECTION II.

SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

THE first I. and second II. heads of this Article concern the Divinity and the Personality of the Holy Ghost.

Both these were treated under the First Article, and it is not necessary to repeat the arguments here. It may be enough to add that among the strongest passages of Scripture in proof of these doctrines will be found the following :—

Divinity. Matt. xii. 32. Acts v. 3, 4. 1 Cor. iii. 16 : compare 1 Cor. vi. 17.

Personality. Matt. xii. 32 ; xxviii. 17. John xiv. 16, 26 ; xvi. 8, 13. Acts v. 3, 4. Rom. viii. 26. 1 Cor. xii. 11. Eph. iv. 30. 1 John v. 7.

III. The third division of the subject is concerning the Procession of the Holy Ghost ; the Article after the Latin versions of the Constantinopolitan Creed, and the Creed of St. Athanasius, asserting that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son.

The distinction between the three Persons in the Godhead was set forth in treating on the first Article. The relation of God the Son to God the Father, how that from all eternity God the Son derived His Being from God the Father, by a proper but ineffable generation, was set forth in the first part of the second Article.

Now whereas it is certain that the Scriptures ever speak of the Second Person of the Trinity as the Son of God, and as *begotten* of the Father, so it is equally certain that they speak of the Spirit as *coming* forth or *proceeding* from the Father, but never as *begotten* of Him. The early Christians, observing this distinction, cautiously adhering to the language of inspiration,

and striving to imbibe the notions conveyed by it, ever taught that it was peculiar to the Father to be underived and unbegotten; to the Son, to be begotten; to the Holy Ghost, to be proceeding¹.

1 That the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, scarcely needs to be proved.

In Matt. x. 20, He is called 'the Spirit of the Father.' In Rom. viii. He is called 'the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead.' In John xiv. 26, 'the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost,' is promised, as to be sent 'by the Father in Christ's name.' In John xv. 26, we read of the 'Comforter... even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father.' Compare also Matt. iii. 16. Acts v. 9. 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11, 14; iii. 16; vi. 19, &c. Accordingly there never has been any doubt, among those who admit the doctrine of the Trinity, that, as the Son is begotten of the Father, so the Spirit proceeds from the Father.

2 But, though the doctrine of the procession of the Spirit from the Father is thus unquestionable, it has been seen that the Greeks doubted the propriety of saying that the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Son as well as from the Father. They doubted it, as it seems, merely because in John xv. 26, it is said 'that the Spirit of truth proceedeth from the Father,' and there is no passage of Scripture, which, in the same express terms, says that the Spirit proceedeth from the Son.

Yet, if we except this one expression of John xv. 26, every other expression whatsoever, from which we infer that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, is used in like manner concerning His relation to the Son. For example;

¹ Ἰδιον Πατρὸς μὲν ἡ ἀγεννησία, Υἱοῦ δὲ ἡ γέννησις, Πνεύματος δὲ ἡ ἐκπεμψις.—Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xxiii. Tom. i. p. 422. Colon. Suicer, Vol. i. p. 1069.

(1) Is He called 'the Spirit of God,' 'the Spirit of the Father,' 'the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus'? In like manner He is called 'the Spirit of Christ,' 'the Spirit of the Son,' 'the Spirit of Jesus Christ.' Thus we read, Rom. viii. 9, 'If any man have not the Spirit of Christ;' where it is evident the Apostle means the Holy Spirit of God spoken of in the preceding sentence. Gal. iv. 6, 'God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son.' Phil. i. 19, 'The supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ.' 1 Pet. i. 11, 'The Spirit of Christ,' which was in the prophets.

And so surely is this the case, that the Greeks themselves were even willing to call the Holy Ghost the Spirit of the Son; confessing that 'He proceedeth from the Father, and is the Spirit of the Son.' And hence many of our divines, and even divines of the Church of Rome, have concluded that their difference on this point from the Western Church was but *in modo loquendi*, in manner of speech, not in fundamental truth¹.

(2) But again, do we infer that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, because He is sent by the Father, and is breathed forth into the prophets by the Father? Still, in like manner we read, that the same Spirit is sent by the Son, and was by Him breathed upon His Apostles. Thus He says Himself, John xv. 26, 'The Comforter, whom I will send unto you from the Father.' John xvi. 7, 'If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you.' And in John xx. 22, after He had risen from the dead, 'He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost.'

Now, our principal reasons for concluding that the Spirit of God proceeds from God the Father are these: viz. that He is

¹ Laud, *Conference with Fisher*, p. 19 (Oxf. 1839), Sect. 9, who quotes Damascene (Lib. i. *Fid. Orth.* c. 11) as saying, Non ex Filio, sed Spiritum Filii esse dicimus.

called the Spirit of the Father, that as the Father sends the Son, who is begotten of Him, so He sends the Spirit, and that He sends Him especially in that manner which in Scripture is called inspiring or breathing forth. From all this we conclude that, like as the Son is begotten, so the Spirit proceedeth of the Father. Yet the Scriptures set forth the relation of the Spirit to the Son, in all these respects, in the very same language in which they set forth the relation of the Spirit to the Father. Hence we conclude that, as the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, so He proceeds from the Son¹. And though we may question the wisdom of adding the words *Filioque* to a Creed drawn up by a General Council, without the authority of a General Council; we yet do not question the truth of the doctrine conveyed by these words, and which we believe was implicitly held by the divines of the Eastern Church, though they shrank from explicit exposition of it in terms.

¹ Nec possumus dicere quod Spiritus Sanctus et a Filio non procedat: neque enim frustra idem Spiritus et Patris et Filii Spiritus dicitur. Nec video quid aliud significare voluerit, cum sufflans in faciem discipulorum ait, *Accipite Spiritum Sanctum*. Neque enim flatus ille corporous, cum sensu corporaliter tangendi procedens ex corpore, substantia Spiritus Sancti fuit, sed demonstratio per congruam significationem, non tantum a Patre sed et a Filio procedere Spiritum Sanctum, &c.—August. *De Trinitat.* Lib. iv. cap. xx. Tom. viii. p. 829. De utroque autem procedere sic docetur, quia ipse Filius ait, *De Patre procedit*. Et cum resurrexit a mortuis et apparuisset discipulis suis, insufflavit et ait, *Accipite Spiritum Sanctum*, ut Eum etiam de Se procedere ostenderet. Et ipsa est *Virtus* quæ *de Illo* *exibat*, sicut legitur in Evangelio, et sanabat omnes.—Ibid. Lib. xv. cap. xxvi. p. 998. See also, *De Civitate Dei*, Lib. xi. c. xxiv. Tom. vii. p. 290; where S. Augustine, shewing that the Holy Spirit is a *Person*, doubts if He can be called the *goodness* of the Father and the Son; but observing that the Father is a Spirit and holy, and the Son is a Spirit and holy, and yet the Third Person of the Trinity is called the *Holy Spirit* of the Father and of the Son, he supposes that that Third Person may be called the Spirit both of the Father and of the Son, and the Holiness both of the Father and of the Son, but yet a substantial Holiness, consubstantial with both.

ARTICLE VI.

Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation.

HOLY Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite necessary to salvation.

In the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical Books of the old and new Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.

Of the Names and Number of the Canonical Books.

Genesis.	The Second Book of
Exodus.	Chronicles.
Leviticus.	The First Book of
Numbers.	Esdras.
Deuteronomy.	The Second Book of
Joshua.	Esdras.
Judges.	The Book of Esther.
Ruth.	The Book of Job.
The First Book of	The Psalms.
Samuel.	The Proverbs.
The Second Book of	Ecclesiastes, or
Samuel.	Preacher.
The First Book of	Cantica, or Songs of
Kings.	Solomon.
The Second Book	Four Prophets the
of Kings.	greater.
The First Book of	Twelve Prophets the
Chronicles.	less.

And the other books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine.

Such are these following :

De Divinis Scripturis, quod sufficient ad Salutem.

SCRIPTURA sacra continet omnia, quæ ad salutem sunt necessaria, ita, ut quicquid in ea nec legitur, neque inde probari potest, non sit a quocquam exigendum, ut tanquam articulus Fidei credatur, aut ad salutis necessitatem requiri putetur.

Sacræ Scripturæ nomine, eos Canonicos libros veteris, et novi Testamenti intelligimus, de quorum auctoritate in Ecclesia nunquam dubitatum est.

De Nominibus et Numero librorum sacræ Canonice Scripturæ Veteris Testamenti.

Genesis.	Secundus Liber Paralipomen.
Exodus.	Primus Liber Esdræ.
Leviticus.	Secundus Liber Esdræ.
Numeri.	Liber Hester.
Deuteron.	Liber Job.
Josue.	Psalms.
Judicum.	Proverbia.
Ruth.	Ecclesiastes vel Concionator.
Prior Liber Samuelis.	Cantica Salomonis.
Secundus Liber Samuelis.	Quarti Prophetæ majores.
Prior Liber Regum.	Duodecimi Prophetæ minores.
Secundus Liber Regum.	
Prior Liber Paralipom.	

Alios autem libros (ut ait Hieronymus) legit quidem Ecclesia, ad exempla vitæ, et formandos mores: illos tamen ad dogmata confirmanda non adhibet, ut sunt.

The Third Book of Esdras.	Baruch the Prophet.	Tertius Liber Esdræ.	Baruch Propheta.
The Fourth Book of Esdras.	The Song of the Three Children.	Quartus Liber Esdræ.	Canticum trium Puerorum.
The Book of Tobias.	The Story of Susanna.	Liber Tobie.	Historia Susannæ.
The Book of Judith.	Of Bel and the Dragon.	Liber Judith.	De Bel et Dracone.
The rest of the Book of Esther.	The Prayer of Manasses.	Reliquam Libri Hester.	Oratio Manassæ.
The Book of Wisdom.	The First Book of Maccabees.	Liber Sapientiæ.	Prior. Lib. Machabeorum.
Jesus the Son of Sirach.	The Second Book of Maccabees.	Liber Jesu filii Sirach.	Secundus Liber Machabeorum.

All the books of the new Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive and account them Canonical.

Novi Testamenti omnes libros (ut vulgo recepti sunt) recipimus, et habemus pro Canonicis.

THIS is the first Article of the Church which can be called controversial. In some respects, it might have seemed natural to have put it as the first Article, as in the Helvetic Confession the first Article is *De Scriptura Sancta, vero Dei Verbo*. But our reformers wisely put forth, in the beginning of their confession of faith, those doctrines on which the Church universal for fifteen centuries had agreed, and which are the foundations of the Christian faith. Accordingly the first five Articles treat of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Redemption of the world, the Sanctification of Christians, and the Judgment of all men. Unity on these points was of old times considered to constitute Catholic Christianity; and by declaring her orthodoxy on these Catholic doctrines, the Church of England, in the very front of her confessions, declares herself orthodox and Catholic.

This done in the first five Articles, she, in the next three, treats of the Rule of Faith, the Scriptures, and the Creeds deduced from them.

The present Article, as it stood in the forty-two Articles of 1552, lacked all the concluding part concerning the Canon of Scripture and the Apocrypha, and treated only of the Sufficiency

of Scripture for Salvation. The latter part was added in 1662. The original Article also contained a clause which was omitted in 1662. After the words, 'whatsoever is neither read therein, nor may be proved thereby,' the words were added, '*although it be sometime received of the godly, and profitable for an order and comeliness*, yet no man ought to be constrained to believe it as an article of faith,' &c.

As the Article now stands, it treats of several distinct points, viz. Scripture and Tradition, the Canon of Scripture, the Apocrypha. On all these points demonstration and history are intimately connected ; history in this case being a material part of demonstration. It will therefore be better not to separate them. In the following sections then I propose to consider,

FIRST. The Sufficiency of Scripture for Salvation.

SECONDLY. The Canon of Scripture.

THIRDLY. The true value of Tradition, and the reading of the Apocrypha.

SECTION I.

THE SUFFICIENCY OF SCRIPTURE FOR SALVATION.

THAT we may see the force of the words of the Article on this important subject, it will be necessary to consider what opinions were opposed by it. Those opinions were the doctrines of the Church of Rome concerning Scripture and Tradition. It will be well therefore to begin by setting the statements of the Church of Rome and those of the Church of England one against the other; and when we see wherein we differ, we may then proceed to shew which is in the right.

Now the decrees of the Council of Trent sufficiently express the doctrines of the Church of Rome. In that Council certain articles, professedly taken from the writings of the Lutheran divines on the subject of Scripture, were discussed in the third session. And first, the fathers of the Council agreed to condemn the opinion, ‘that all articles of the Christian faith, necessary to be believed, are contained in the Holy Scriptures, and that it is sacrilege to hold the oral Tradition of the Church to be of equal authority with the old and new Testaments¹.’ The formal decree of the Council was drawn up in the fourth session, in the year 1546, shortly after the death of Luther, and six years before the putting forth of the forty-two Articles of our own Church in 1552. This decree declares, that ‘the truth is contained in *the written books*, and in the *unwritten traditions*, which, having been received by the Apostles, either from the mouth of Christ Himself, or from the dictates of the Holy Spirit, were handed down even to us;’ and that the Council ‘receives and venerates with *equal feeling of piety and reverence* all the books of the old and new Testament, since one

¹ Sarpi, *Hist. of the Council of Trent*, translated by Brent. London, 1676, p. 141.

God was the Author of them both, *and also the traditions* relating as well to *faith* as to *morals*, as having, either from the mouth of Christ Himself, or from the dictation of the Holy Ghost, been preserved by continuous succession in the Catholic Church¹.'

Exactly corresponding with this decree of the Council are the statements of the great Roman Catholic divines. For example, Bellarmine says, 'The controversy between us and the heretics consists in two things. The first is that *we* assert, that in Scripture is not expressly contained all necessary doctrine, whether concerning faith or morals, and therefore that beside the written Word of God there is moreover needed the unwritten word, *i.e.* Divine and Apostolical Tradition. But *they* teach that all things necessary for faith and morals are contained in the Scriptures, and that therefore there is no need of the unwritten word².'

Now these statements are not easily misunderstood. The

¹ Sacrosancta oecumenica et generalis Tridentina Synodus, in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata, præsidentibus in ea eisdem tribus Apostolicæ sedis legatis, hoc sibi perpetuo ante oculos proponens, ut sublatis erroribus, puritas ipsa Evangelii in Ecclesia conservetur: quod promissum ante per prophetas in Scripturis sanctis Dominus noster, Jesus Christus, Dei Filius, proprio ore primum promulgavit, deinde per suos Apostolos tanquam fontem omnis salutaris veritatis et morum disciplinæ, omni creaturæ prædicari jussit; perspicuens hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in *libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus*, quæ ab ipsius Christi ore et Apostolis acceptæ, Spiritu Sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditæ ad nos usque pervenerunt: Orthodoxorum patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam veteris quam novi Testamenti, cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, *necnon traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus a Christo vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas, et continua successione in Ecclesia Catholica conservatas, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit ac veneratur.*—Sess. iv. Can. i. Conc. xiv. 746.

² Bellarmin. *De Verbo Dei non Scripto*, Lib. iv. cap. iii. Controversia igitur inter nos et hereticos in duobus consistit. Primum est, quod nos asserimus, in Scripturis non contineri expresse totam doctrinam necessariam sive de fide sive de moribus; et proinde præter Verbum Dei scriptum, requiri etiam Verbum Dei non scriptum, id est, divinas et Apostolicas traditiones. At ipsi docent, in Scripturis omnia contineri ad fidem et mores necessaria, et proinde non esse opus ullo Verbo non scripto.

Church of Rome, both in her Council, and by the mouth of her most eminent divines, asserts, that Scripture does not contain all that is necessary for faith and morals; but that there is need of a traditional doctrine, an unwritten word, which is handed down by unbroken tradition in the Church, and which she, the Church of Rome, esteems with the same feelings of piety and reverence with which she receives the Holy Scriptures. It is not merely an Hermeneutical Tradition, *i. e.* certain doctrines handed down from early times, which are useful for clearing up and explaining obscurities in Holy Writ; nor is it an Ecclesiastical Tradition, *i. e.* Tradition concerning Church discipline, rites and ceremonies; but it is a traditional revelation concerning doctrine, in matters of faith and morals, which is not to be found in Scripture, and which is equally certain, equally Divine, and equally to be embraced, and revered with Scripture itself. Scripture and Tradition are parallel, equal, and equally venerable sources of doctrine; and one without the other is not sufficient for salvation.

Such being the statement of the Church of Rome, we may the better understand the statement of the Church of England. Her statement is, as expressed in the Article of 1552, that, however traditions may be ‘sometimes received by the faithful as godly, and profitable for order and comeliness,’ yet ‘Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation;’ and no man ought ‘to be constrained to believe as an article of faith, or repute requisite to the necessity of salvation, whatever is neither read therein nor may be proved thereby.’

The degree of value which the Church of England has assigned to Tradition, which, she said, in the forty-two Articles, was ‘sometimes received by the faithful as godly, and profitable for order,’ we shall see in the third section. Here we have to shew that, as regards articles of faith, and as to necessity of salvation, nothing ought to be required of any man ‘which is not read in Scripture, or may be proved thereby.’

Scripture, according to the Church of England, rightly interpreted, contains all that is necessary to save the soul. From it, by fair and logical inference, may be deduced every thing which ought to be imposed as an article of faith. It will be seen, hereafter, that she does not despise nor underrate the light of learning, nor the light of antiquity, but that, as the ground of appeal, she maintains the supremacy, and the sole supremacy, of the written word of God¹.

Now in proving the soundness of the Anglican, in opposition to the Romish position, we may proceed in the following order.

We may prove,

- I. That Scripture is in favour of it.
- II. That Reason is in favour of it.
- III. That the Primitive Fathers are in favour of it.

I. Scripture is in favour of the doctrine of the Anglican Church, viz. that the written word of God is sufficient for salvation, containing all necessary articles of faith, and rules of life.

On most questions this argument is the most conclusive that can be brought; but on the Sufficiency of Scripture, we are not so likely to find Scripture speaking plainly as on many other points. It does indeed bear witness to itself, and yet its witness is true. But though both parties have appealed to it, yet neither party have been satisfied, that, on this particular point, its high authority will exhaust the subject.

1 To take first of all the arguments, which have been

¹ 'Unto a Christian man there can be nothing either more necessary or profitable than the knowledge of Holy Scripture, forasmuch as in it is contained God's true Word, setting forth His glory and also man's duty. And there is no truth nor doctrine necessary for our justification and everlasting salvation, but that is, or may be, drawn out of that fountain and well of truth.'—Beginning of the *Homily on Holy Scripture*.

alleged from Scripture, as *against* its own sufficiency : we read, that our Lord said to His disciples (John xvi. 12) : ‘ I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.’ Therefore it is inferred that there was need of further instruction, orally delivered to the Church, and handed down by tradition, beyond what our Lord revealed, whilst on earth. But the true meaning of the passage is explained by the next verse, which promises that ‘ when the Spirit of truth was come, He should guide them into all truth.’ It was to the teaching of the Spirit, by whom the Apostles were afterwards inspired, that our Lord bade them look forward for the filling up of what His own personal teaching had left deficient. The substance of that teaching of the Spirit we believe is preserved to us in the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse ; not in unwritten tradition.

Again, it is said, ‘ There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, even the world could not contain the books that should be written’ (John xxi. 25). Therefore Jesus taught many things not set down in Scripture : we cannot believe that He taught any thing superfluous : therefore there must be something necessary, besides what we read in Scripture. Where are we to seek for this ? Of course, in unwritten tradition.

To this we reply, that doubtless every word spoken by our blessed Lord was most valuable. Many of those words indeed are not in Scripture ; no ! nor yet in tradition : for it never yet was pretended that oral tradition had preserved every word our Saviour uttered. So that if this argument proves any thing, it proves too much ; for it proves not only the insufficiency of Scripture, but the insufficiency of Scripture and tradition together. What we say is simply, that so much of Christ’s divine teaching, and of the teaching of the Spirit to the Apostles, is set down in Scripture, as is necessary for salvation, and for the proving of all necessary articles of faith. It is no argument

against this to say, that many things which our Saviour said are not in Scripture.

The same answer may be given to the argument drawn from the fact that, during the forty days between His resurrection and His ascension, our Lord 'spake of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God' (Acts i. 3). We know indeed that His speeches then are not set down in Scripture. But we equally know that they are not to be found in any other tradition. And we do not know that there was anything spoken by Him then, which it is necessary to our salvation that we should know, over and above what we have recorded in Scripture.

It is further urged that St Paul cuts short a controversy, not by reference to Scripture, but by appeal to the customs of the Church (1 Cor. xi. 16): 'If any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the Churches of God.' It was a matter of ceremony, viz. that a woman's head should be covered in the house of God: and assuredly the Church of England fully admits that 'the Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies' (Art. xx), and that 'whosoever, through his private judgment, breaks the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the word of God, ought to be rebuked openly' (Art. xxxiv.). But this is no proof that doctrines of the faith rest on an authority not written. It should be sufficient to satisfy any caviller concerning *forms*, that the Churches of God have, or have not, a custom or a form. But it is not likely that the Apostle would *for doctrine* refer to the Church's customs, when he himself was infallibly guided by the Spirit of God.

But St. Paul, it is said, actually does refer to ordinances and traditions, and forms of words, and a *depositum* to be guarded; all which are evidently oral traditions of the Church. 'Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you,' 1 Cor.

xi. 2. 'O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust,' 1 Tim. vi. 20. 'Hold fast the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. That good thing which was committed unto thee (τὴν καλὴν παρακαταθήκην) keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us,' 2 Tim. i. 13, 14. 'The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also,' 2 Tim. ii. 2. From all this it is urged, that the Church and the bishops had ordinances intrusted to them, and doctrines committed to them, which they were to watch and guard, and hand down carefully to others. But all this we readily admit. Timothy was taught by St. Paul : and the doctrine, which he had so learned, was a sacred deposit which he had carefully to guard, and to teach to those committed to his care ; especially to the clergy under him, and the bishops who were to succeed him. Before the Scriptures of the new Testament had been written, or at least collected, this must have been a most important principle ; for so only could the torch of truth be kept alight. And even after the new Testament had been written, and was in the hands of all men, it was doubtless most important that bishops and Churches should be rightly and soundly instructed in the truth and right meaning of the Scriptures, and should guard themselves and their flocks against perverting the truth, and falling into error. But there is not therefore any reason to apprehend, that Timothy or the Church had learned any other doctrines besides those contained in the holy Scriptures, or that the sacred deposit committed to their charge was any other than the aggregate of Christian doctrine, which they had been taught catechetically, and which they were to keep from defilement and error by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us. We well know that the possession of the Scriptures, as a source of truth and as a final appeal, does not supersede the necessity of Christian education and sound oral instruction in the faith ; and to every person,

now-a-days, instructed by Creeds and Catechisms in the true doctrine of Christ, it might be said, 'Keep that good thing which was committed unto you;' 'Hold fast the form of sound words.' Yet all this instruction and this sacred deposit may be deducible from Scripture, and virtually contained in it.

But further, it is said, that the Thessalonians are actually bidden to 'stand fast and hold the *traditions*, which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle,' 2 Thess. ii. 15. Therefore the Apostle bids them attend not only to Scripture, but to tradition also. But the word *tradition* means properly nothing more than *something delivered, the doctrine of our faith delivered to us*. And there being two ways of delivering doctrines to us, either by writing or by word of mouth, it signifies either of them indifferently. "παράδοσις, *tradition*, is the same with δόγμα doctrine, and παραδίδόναι is the same with διδάσκειν," say the grammarians: and the παραδοθεῖσα πίστις in St. Jude, "the faith once delivered;" is the same which St. Paul explicates by saying, παραδόσεις ἃς ἐδιδάχθητε, "the traditions," that is, "the doctrines ye were taught." And St. Irenæus (Lib. iii. ch. iv.) calls it a tradition apostolical, that "Christ took the cup," and said, "it was His blood," and to believe in one God, and in Christ "who was born of a Virgin," was the old tradition; that is the thing which was delivered, and not at first written, "which was kept by the barbarians¹." It may be added, that the very words of St. Paul, in the passage now alluded to, prove in themselves that tradition, according to him, was not necessarily oral tradition, or traditions floating in the Church: for he calls his own Epistles, or the doctrine contained in them, *tradition*—'*traditions*, which you have been taught either by word or by our *Epistles*.' What therefore the Apostle here enjoins on the Thessalonians is simply, that, as he had taught them by preaching, and as he

¹ Jer. Taylor, *Dissuasive from Popery*, Part II. Bk. I. Sect. 3.

had enjoined them by letter, so they should believe and live. This instruction, thus received, was the tradition to which he alludes. But it by no means follows, because, before Scripture was completed, the Apostles gave oral and epistolary instruction, to which their hearers were to attend, that therefore, after the Scriptures were completed and collected, there must be left, floating about, a stream of traditional truth, which is not to be found in those Scriptures, thus completed and collected. Before the Scriptures of the new Testament were written, there must of course have been need of tradition, or instruction by word of mouth; and such instruction coming from inspired Apostles was, no doubt, of as much value as what they committed to writing; but the question is, whether they delivered any thing essential to our salvation, which they, or some of them, did not subsequently put down in writing, so that it should be carefully preserved, and be a constant witness in the Church. Certainly neither this, nor any of the before-cited passages of Scripture, prove that they did¹.

Once more, it is said that Christ promised to His Church, 'The gates of Hell shall not prevail against it,' Matt. xvi. 18; 'I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world,' Matt. xxviii. 20; 'Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven,' Matt. xviii. 18, &c.; and that these promises prove, that a certain infallibility should reside in the Church, which both makes it a sure keeper of the truth, and renders all its traditions and decrees of sacred authority. But, we may reply, that, even if we concede that the whole Church, fully represented, might so claim the promise of Christ to be present

¹ The passages from Scripture, which have been quoted in the text, are all alleged by Bellarmine, *De Verbo Dei non Scripto*, Lib. iv.

On the proper meaning of the word *Tradition*, see Jer. Taylor as above; Ussher, *Answer to a Jesuit*, Ch. ii.; Bp. Patrick's Discourse about Tradition in the first Vol. of Gibson, *Preservative against Popery*, p. 190; Van Mildert's *Bampton Lectures*, Sermon iii.

with it, and to guide it, that it should not fall into errors in matters of faith; yet it follows not, that it would be authorized to preserve or to decree any truth which cannot be proved from Scriptures. Ancient councils settled many points of faith, and drew up creeds and confessions; but they all professed to be accordant with, and capable of proof from, Scripture. And though the Church is a keeper and a witness of Holy Writ, and may expound Scripture for the instruction of her children, and in such expositions may look for the promise of Christ and the guidance of His Spirit; it by no means follows that she has authority to add to 'the faith once delivered to the saints,' or to set up any standard of doctrine besides that written word of God, which is entrusted to her, and to which she is to look as the source of all heavenly wisdom and truth.

2 And here we may dismiss the arguments from Scripture which have been brought to prove, that Scripture does not contain all doctrine necessary for salvation and godliness. We proceed to consider those passages which appear to prove the direct contrary, viz. that all things, of necessity to be believed, are contained in, or may be deduced from, the written word.

The following are amongst the texts commonly alleged:

'Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it.' Deut. iv. 2.

'The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul.' Ps. xix. 7.

'Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of Me.' John v. 39.

'From a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.' 2 Tim. iii. 15—17.

These passages *appear* to prove the perfection and sufficiency of the Scriptures. But it is argued against this inference, that, with regard to the first two passages, they speak of God's commandments and God's law, whether written or unwritten¹. The third passage may be, and very likely ought to be, translated, not 'search,' but, 'ye search the Scriptures.' And all the passages relate to the old Testament, not to the new; for neither could the Jews search the new Testament Scriptures, neither could Timothy have learned the new Testament from his childhood; since none of the books of the new Testament were then written. If therefore these passages prove the sufficiency of Scripture, they prove that the old Testament was sufficient without the new, and therefore prove too much. The passages indeed prove that all which comes from God is perfect, and very necessary for instruction, but do not fully prove that nothing but Scripture is necessary.

Another argument is drawn from the following passages:

'Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed amongst us.....it seemed good to me also..... to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed.' Luke i. 1—4.

'These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His Name.' John xx. 31.

These texts do certainly seem to shew that the object of writing the Gospels was expressly, that men might not be left to the uncertainty of tradition. Many had taken in hand to

¹ Bellarmine indeed argues that the passage from Deut. iv. 2 applies only to the *unwritten word*: 'the word which I *speak* unto you.' The word however is not '*speak*,' as he renders it, but *צִוְּיָהּ* '*command*,' as our translators give it.—Bellarmin. *De Verbo Dei non Scripto*, Bk. iv.

set forth an account of the Gospel history : St. Luke therefore was moved to commit it carefully to writing, that no vague accounts might mislead Theophilus, but that by the written word he might ‘know the *certainty* of those things wherein he had before been catechetically instructed.’ Very similar to this is the language of St. Peter : ‘I will endeavour that ye may be able after my decease to have these things always in remembrance,’ 2 Pet. i. 15. It is true, that these three passages only apply to the Gospels of St. Luke and St. John, and the Epistles of St. Peter, and perhaps with them to the Gospel of St. Mark ; but they nevertheless give the reasons for writing Scripture, and are, as far as they go, a strong presumption against the vagueness and uncertainty of oral, and in favour of the certainty of written, tradition.

Again, ignorance and error in religion is traced to ignorance of Scripture : ‘Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God,’ Matt. xxii. 29. The peculiar privilege of the Jews is said to be that ‘to them were committed the oracles of God,’ Rom. iii. 1, 2. In matters of doubt, all appeals are made to Scripture. The Bereans are praised because they ‘searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so,’ Acts xvii. 11. So under the old Testament it was ‘to the law and to the testimony : if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them,’ Isai. viii. 20 ; where the law and the testimony must mean the Law of Moses, and the testimony of God given by the Prophets.

Lastly, there is special reprobation of all traditions which add to Scripture or take from it. The passage in the end of the Apocalypse (‘If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book,’ &c., Rev. xxii. 18, 19) may indeed apply only to that book itself, and to the uncorrupted preservation of its text. But we cannot have read the Gospels without seeing how much those who used Jewish traditions are censured and condemned :

‘Why do ye transgress the commandment of God by your tradition?’ ‘In vain they do worship Me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.’ (Matt. xv. 3, 9, comp. Mark vii. 7—13). It is true, the traditions spoken of were Jewish, not Christian traditions. But the principle was much the same. The Pharisees claimed such traditions as divine. They professed that they were the unwritten word of God, handed down from the time of Ezra, through the doctors of the Law, and the members of the Great Synagogue. They did not deny the value of the written word, but added the unwritten traditions to it. These they considered, not as corrupting, but as completing the truth. Yet our Lord declared that they ‘made the word of God of none effect by their tradition’ (Mark vii. 13). And thus we may fairly infer, that our Lord condemns the general principle of making any addition to the written word, by doctrines professedly handed down from father to son. We see, at least, no difference in principle between the oral traditions of the Jewish, and the oral traditions of the Christian Church.

II. We come next to shew that reason is in favour of the Anglican, in opposition to the Roman rule on this subject.

1 The English Church does not hold that unwritten truth is less true than written truth : and if we could be certain that any unwritten doctrine came from Christ and His Apostles, we should receive it with the same reverence that we pay to the written word. But the reason why we rest our faith upon the written word is this : We know that *it* came from God ; but we have no certain knowledge that any unwritten tradition did. The former we *know* to be the mid-day light, the other *may be* but an *ignis fatuus*, and lead us into error.

And let it once more be clearly understood, that the question is not, what value there may be in the testimony of the Early Church to certain doctrines of the faith, not, how far early traditions may be useful for the interpreting of Scrip-

ture ; not, how far we may be right to adhere to the primitive example, in matters of *discipline* and *ceremony*, even those for which we have no Scriptural authority ; but it is, whether besides, parallel with, and independent of the Scripture, there is in the Church a *doctrina tradita*, a doctrine handed down from Christ or His Apostles, of equal authority with Scripture, and demanding equal respect.

As has just now been said, when we search for authority in favour of any doctrine, we can tell at once where to go, if Scripture be our rule. But if we have to depend on something besides, where must we look ? The former rule is contained in a small compass, is easily accessible, and with proper assistance, may be understood. The latter is to be searched for through many folio volumes ; is, at last, not certainly to be found ; and is at least as difficult as Scripture itself to be understood and explained. Or, if it be said, that it is not in the writings of the fathers, but in the stream of Church tradition, a deposit which was entrusted to the Church, and has never been lost by her ; we can only reply, that this is even less certain than traditions which may be searched out from ancient writings, and from them proved to have anciently existed. Tradition by word of mouth is a thing proverbially uncertain. In peculiar conditions of society, or for a short time, it may be sufficient for the preservation of truth. But it is evidently unfitted for a body like the Catholic Church ; which was to pervade all nations, extend throughout all ages, weather the storm of ignorance and barbarism at one time, and bear up against the scorching and withering glare of learned infidelity at another.

The very fact that the Scriptures were written, and the history of their writing, seem to prove their sufficiency and perfection. When first revelation was given to man, men's lives were so long that there was little danger lest the light of truth should be lost. Adam, Seth, Enoch, Methuselah, Noah,

were in fact all but contemporaries. Seth the son of Adam lived to within fifteen years of the birth of Noah. Tradition therefore may have sufficed for them; and yet we have reason to believe that, even then, the faith was much corrupted. Again, the sons of Noah must have been contemporary with Abraham, to whom another revelation was given; yet Abraham's fathers had become idolaters. And in the few generations from Abraham to Moses, the faith again appears to have been corrupted, if not lost; although from the death of Joseph to the birth of Moses not seventy years had passed. Thus, when the world and the Church were under the most favourable circumstances for preserving tradition of the truth unimpaired, it pleased God to leave the world, with occasional revelations indeed, but mostly with only traditional knowledge of the truth. Yet, even so, such knowledge was soon corrupted, and easily lost. After that, God gave a fuller revelation to Moses, and enjoined that it should be committed to writing; and the book of the Law was deposited in the most sacred place of the Sanctuary, and most carefully guarded and watched, as of inestimable value. Thenceforward, when any great prophet was sent to Israel, though, during his lifetime, he orally taught the people, yet his words were ever committed to writing, that they might be preserved after his death. Nor do we know anything now concerning the teaching of any of the prophets, save only what is handed down to us, not by oral but by written tradition, viz. the Scriptures of the old Testament.

Most similar was the case with the Christian Church. At first, whilst our Lord and His Apostles were on earth, their personal teaching, and that of those taught by them, might have sufficed. Yet, even then, errors and perversions were creeping in; and if they had not committed the substance of their teaching to writing, the false traditions of the Judaizers, the Cerinthians, or the Gnostics, might have come down through the Church instead of the true traditions of the disciples of

Christ. But we learn from ancient writers that what the Apostles preached by word of mouth, they committed, or caused to be committed to writing, lest the substance of their preaching should be lost¹. If tradition committed to the Church had been sufficient to preserve the truth, then the writing of the four Gospels, and of the other parts of the new Testament, would have been superfluous. But from the known and well-proved insufficiency of the former, the Apostles, under the guidance of the Spirit, had recourse to the latter mode of insuring a source and a rule of faith.

‘The Apostles at first owned these writings; the Churches received them; they transmitted them to their posterity; they grounded their faith upon them; they proved their propositions by them; -by them they confuted heretics; and they made them the measure of right and wrong: all that collective body of doctrine of which all Christians collectively made public confessions, and on which all their hopes of salvation did rely, were all contained in them, and they agreed in no point of faith which is not plainly set down in Scripture².’

¹ *E. g.* Μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων (i. e. τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου) ἔξοδον Μάρκος, ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε.—*Iren. Hæc.* iii. 1.

So again: Hanc fidem annuntians Joannes Domini discipulus, volens per Evangelii annuntiationem auferre eum qui insemminatus erat hominibus errorem, et multo prius ab his qui dicuntur Nicolaitæ. . . . omnia igitur talia circumscribere volens discipulus Domini, et regulam veritatis constituere in ecclesia. . . . sic inchoavit in ea quæ erat secundum Evangelii doctrina: In principio erat Verbum. . . . *Hæres.* iii. xi.

Τοσούτον ἐπέλαμψεν ταῖς τῶν ἀκροατῶν τοῦ Πετροῦ διανοίαις εὐσεβείας φέγγος, ὥς μὴ τῇ εἰσάπαξ ἱκανῶς ἔχειν ἀρκεῖσθαι ἀκοῇ, μηδὲ τῇ ἀγράφῳ τοῦ θείου κηρύγματος διδασκαλίᾳ· παρακλήσεσι δὲ παντοίαις Μάρκον, οὗ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον φέρεται, ἀκόλουθον ὄντα Πέτρου λιπαρήσαι, ὥς ἂν καὶ διὰ γραφῆς ὑπόμνημα τῆς διὰ λόγου παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς καταλείψοι διδασκαλίας· μὴ πρότερόν τε ἀνεῖναι ἢ κατεργάσασθαι τὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ ταύτῃ αἰτίους γενέσθαι τῆς τοῦ λεγομένου κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίου γραφῆς.—*Euseb. H. E.* ii. 15. He gives this account on the authority of Papias and Clemens Alexand.

² *Jer. Taylor, Dissuasive from Popery, Pt. ii. Bk. i. Sect. 3.*

Now Scripture having been thus evidently designed to correct the uncertainty, and supply the deficiency of tradition, it is unreasonable to suppose that God would have suffered Scripture itself, the more certain guide, to be imperfect, and to need the less certain guide, tradition, to supply its defects. Yet, if Scripture itself does not contain the sum and substance of our religion, and all necessary articles of faith, this would be the case.

But, as a matter of fact, Scripture has ever been adduced by divines of all schools and all communions as capable of proving all the great doctrines of the faith, and all the important rules of duty. We can either prove by it, or deduce from it, the great doctrines concerning the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Sanctification of the Spirit, Original Sin, Justification, the grace of the Sacraments, the privileges of the Church, the Communion of Saints, the Judgment of the great day, and other weighty and cardinal points of faith. And though different schools have differed as to how Scripture should be interpreted on some of these points, yet all have agreed that the true doctrine concerning them may be gathered from Scripture, if interpreted aright. Whatever value, therefore, we may attribute to a *Traditio Hermeneutica*, to traditional interpretations of Scripture, we ought to be satisfied that all things 'to be required of any man as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation,' are so contained in Scripture, that they may be either 'read therein, or may be proved thereby.'

Several things, indeed, all men allow, are contained in Scripture which are not absolutely necessary to salvation, although they may tend to edification; and if the lesser matters were inserted there, how can we suppose that the greater would be omitted? Nay, although the Church of Rome often appeals to tradition, as a necessary part of Divine Revelation, yet it may well be questioned whether even she

pretends that any very important truth is to be derived from tradition alone. And assuredly we may safely assert that there is a total absence of all evidence to prove that there is even professedly any tradition extant to which we are indebted for the knowledge of any great doctrine of the faith independently of the written word.

2 The principal arguments from reason in favour of the Romanist, and against the Anglican view of this subject, are as follows :

(1) Tradition was the first rule. From Adam to Moses all was traditional ; and from the coming of Christ, to the completion of the Canon of the new Testament, tradition must have been the principal guide of the Church. Scripture, therefore, which came in afterwards, cannot supersede that which was before it, and which, at first, was sufficient without it.

This argument has already been virtually answered by anticipation. The duration of men's lives before the time of Moses, and the presence and personal teaching of inspired Apostles, before the writing of the new Testament, were great safeguards against error. The fact that, as these safeguards were withdrawn, God's Providence ordered that the Scriptures should be written and preserved, shews of itself that tradition, which might have been sufficient then, would not be sufficient now. We do not say that Scripture supersedes tradition, but that it is itself the surest tradition, and the only one on which we can safely rely. It is in fact the Patriarchal, Levitical, and Apostolical tradition, preserved in its safest and only certain form.

(2) It is said that Scripture was not written systematically, but casually, as circumstances occurred, in casual memoirs, and occasional letters ; and therefore cannot be looked on as a systematic collection of doctrine and morality.

This, however, is no proof that the whole sum of necessary

truth may not be extracted from it. *How* holy men of old were moved to speak, or to write, seems of little consequence. God's wisdom saw fit that it should be in the way in which we have the Scriptures now. It is certainly in a more interesting, it is probably in a more profitable way, than if a systematic arrangement had been adopted. It is not probable even that the Apostles' teaching, nor even that of our Lord, was always systematic ; and yet in that, all men admit that all necessary truth was contained. It cannot, therefore, be necessary to our position to shew that the Scriptures are formally or systematically designed.

(3) The authenticity and canonicity of Scripture itself rest on tradition, and on tradition alone ; and if tradition is necessary to prove this, it may equally prove other doctrines.

It is true indeed that historical testimony, and the universal consent of all the early Christians, are the chief grounds on which we rely for proof, that the various books of the new Testament were the works of those whose names they bear. This indeed is, in a great measure, the way in which we prove the authenticity of every ancient book. We do not know that a book was written by Cæsar or Tacitus but by testimony and historical evidence. In like manner, testimony and historical evidence are essential to prove that the works ascribed to St. Peter or St. Paul were really theirs. In this latter case indeed we have the most convincing and satisfactory proofs ; for we have the testimony of early Christians, of early heretics, of ancient heathens, of friends and of enemies ; and besides this, the testimony of the Church catholic in general councils. These are things which we should never lightly value under any circumstances : and when we have to deal with the question concerning the genuineness of certain books, such a kind of evidence is the most obvious, the most necessary, and the most satisfactory possible. But it does not follow that we should give the same deference to the same testimony, even if such

could be found, on points of doctrine. For the opinions of Cæsar or Tacitus we prefer the words of their own books to any testimony external to those books. And so for the doctrines of the Apostles, we look first and chiefly to what they have written. Besides, we have concerning the Canon of Scripture an universality of consent, which it would be utterly in vain to search for concerning any doctrine of the faith which is not also to be found in Scripture. When the Roman Church can bring a like amount of consentient testimony to prove any doctrine on which Scripture is silent, we may then, and not till then, entertain the question of a *doctrina tradita*, parallel to, and of equal authority with, Scripture.

(4) It is farther said, that many necessary things are not set down in Scripture.

Bellarmino mentions the following¹:—

- a.* How women under the old Law might be delivered from Original Sin, circumcision being only for males; and how males under eight days old might be saved from it.
- b.* The Perpetual Virginity of the blessed Virgin Mary, which has always been believed by the Church, and yet is not in Scripture.
- c.* That Easter should be kept on a Sunday, which is necessary to be believed against the Quarto-decimans.
- d.* Infant Baptism, which is necessary to be believed; but neither Romanists nor Protestants can prove it from Scripture.
- e.* That there is a Purgatory, which Luther himself believed, and yet admitted it could not be found in Scripture.

¹ *De Verbo Dei non Scripto*, Lib. iv.

If these are all the points that Scripture is silent upon, we need not be very solicitous about its deficiencies. None of them surely can be essential to our salvation. None, except the last two, materially concern our personal faith or practice. The last we not only admit is not in Scripture, but we positively deny that it is true. The last but one, Infant Baptism, we think may be fairly inferred from Scripture, when fully consulted on the subject; and we are very thankful to have the additional testimony of the primitive Church concerning it, which we never reject as a help and guide to the truth and right understanding of the Scriptures, but only as a distinct and independent authority. The question concerning Easter is one of ceremony not of faith, and we gladly follow the primitive Church in matters of this nature; although we do not hold that ceremonies must be one and the same everywhere. The doctrine concerning the Perpetual Virginity is rather a pious opinion than a necessary article of faith. Our own greatest divines have mostly adhered to the primitive opinion on this subject¹. But we cannot think that any man's salvation is the surer for believing, or the less sure for disbelieving it.

The question concerning Original Sin, and how women under the Law were delivered from it, and still more, the question concerning infants under eight days old, is as much left in obscurity by tradition as by Scripture. It is one of those things concerning which we have no revelation.

(5) But it is said, that some of the chief articles of faith, though deduced from Scripture, yet could not be proved from Scripture alone, without the help of tradition and the testimony of the Church. Among the rest are enumerated, the equality

¹ Andrews' *Devotions*: see Prayers for Monday. Jer. Taylor, *Life of Christ*, § 2. Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. 'Born of the Virgin Mary.' Bp. Bull, *Works*, Vol. i. p. 96.

of the Divine Persons in the Trinity, the Procession of the Spirit from both the Father and the Son, the Descent into Hell, Original Sin, the change of the Sabbath to the Lord's Day.

The proof of most of these doctrines from Scripture has already been given under the preceding Articles. We maintain that the equality of the Persons in the Godhead, and the other great doctrines concerning the Trinity, also the Descent into Hell, and Original Sin, are clearly deducible from Scripture alone. We do not indeed reject the testimony of antiquity, but view it as a valuable guide to the true meaning of Holy Writ: but we maintain that these doctrines might be proved even without its aid. As to the Procession of the Holy Ghost, if Scripture will not prove it, certainly tradition will not. In considering the last Article, we saw that the tradition of the Western was different, in some respects, from that of the Eastern Church. The Nicene Creed for some centuries lacked the *Filioque*. And from the evidence in favour of the doctrine, which we deduced from Scripture, it should appear that Scripture speaks more plainly upon it than tradition, or the Church. The change of the Sabbath to the Lord's Day is not an article of faith; but it is doubtless a matter of some moment. It is true, that without the aid of history we might find some difficulty in discovering whether the early Christians did give up observing the Jewish Sabbath, and kept festival on the first day of the week. But even so, we think Scripture alone would give us proof that the Lord's Day was to be observed, and that the Jewish Sabbath was not to be observed. Certainly, we read of the first day of the week as the day on which Christians held their assemblies, administered the Lord's Supper (Acts xx. 7), and collected alms for the poor (1 Cor. xvi. 2). So the Apostle St. John 'was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day' (Rev. i. 10). But 'Sabbath-days' are enumerated as one of the 'shadows of things to come,' which belonged to

the old dispensation, and so were not binding on Christians (Col. ii. 16, 17). Hence the new Testament gives us good reason to believe that the obligation to keep the seventh day of the week had passed away, and that the weekly festival of the Christian Church was not Saturday, but Sunday. If it be not conceded that such Scriptural authority be sufficient to satisfy us, we may reply, that the keeping of the Lord's Day is not a question essential to our salvation, like the great doctrines of our faith ; and that, therefore, even if we require historical or traditional evidence concerning it, in addition to Scripture, this will not be a case to interfere with this Article of our Church, which speaks only of articles of faith, and things necessary to salvation.

(6) Lastly, it is said, Scripture is in many things so obscure, that tradition is necessary to explain its meaning.

To this we reply, that there is, at times, no doubt, some difficulty. The Church of England does not reject the use of all proper aids for the explanation of Scripture. She encourages recourse to human learning, in order to elucidate the language of Holy Writ. She does by no means reject any light which may be derived from primitive antiquity, and she is anxious to cherish a learned clergy for the instruction of her poorer and more ignorant members. Her rule too concerning Scripture is not, that every uneducated person ought to take the Scriptures in hand, and search out for himself a system of theology. She teaches her children by catechisms and other simple steps to knowledge of the truth. All that she maintains is, that, as a final court of appeal, Scripture is perfect and sufficient. Her children may, by intelligent and humble study of the Scriptures, find in them full authority for all she teaches, and do not require a second, independent authority.

The fathers acknowledge the Scriptures to be sufficiently plain, if expounded by comparing Scripture with Scripture. Irenæus tells us to solve the more difficult parts of Scripture

by having recourse to those which are easy¹. And Chrysostom says 'Look for no other teacher; thou hast the oracles of God; none teaches thee like these².'

'There is no question but there are many places in the Divine Scriptures, mysterious, intricate and secret: but these are for the learned, not for the ignorant; for the curious and inquisitive, not for the busied and employed and simple: they are not repositories of salvation, but instances of labour, and occasions of humility, and arguments of forbearance and mutual toleration, and an endearment of reverence and adoration. But all that, by which God brings us to Himself, is easy and plain³.'

III. We have, lastly, to prove that the testimony of the primitive fathers is in favour of the Anglican rule, and not of the Roman.

1 Irenæus says: 'We know that the Scriptures are perfect, as being spoken by the Word of God and His Spirit⁴.' Again: 'We have received the disposition of our salvation by no others but those by whom the Gospel came to us; which they then preached, and afterwards by God's will delivered to us in the Scriptures, to be the pillar and ground of our faith⁵.'

¹ Omnis autem quæstio non per aliud quod quæritur habebit resolutionem, nec ambiguitas per aliam ambiguitatem solvetur apud eos qui sensum habent, aut ænigmata per aliud majus ænigma, sed ea quæ sunt talia ex manifestis et consonantibus et claris accipiunt solutionem.—Lib. II. 10. See Beaven's *Account of Irenæus*, p. 138.

² *Homil. ix. in Ep. Coloss.*

³ Jer. Taylor, *Dissuasive from Popery*, Part II. Bk. I. § 2.

⁴ Cedere hæc talia debemus Deo qui et nos fecit, rectissime scientes quia Scripturæ quidem perfectæ sunt, quippe a Verbo Dei et Spiritu ejus dictæ.—Lib. II. c. 47.

⁵ Non enim per alios dispositionem salutis nostræ cognovimus, quam per eos per quos Evangelium pervenit ad nos: quod quidem tunc præconiaverunt, postea vero per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum et columnam fidei nostræ futurum.—Lib. III. c. 1.

Tertullian says: 'I adore the perfection of Scripture, which declares to me the Creator and His works whether all things were made of pre-existent matter, I have as yet no where read. Let the school of Hermogenes shew that it is written. If it is not written, let them fear the woe which is destined for them who add to or take away¹.'

Origen says: 'The two Testaments in which every word that appertains to God may be sought out and discussed, and from them all knowledge of things may be understood. If anything remain, which Holy Scripture doth not determine, no third Scripture ought to be had recourse to but that which remaineth we must commit to the fire, *i. e.* reserve it unto God. For God would not have us know all things in this world².'

Hippolytus writes: 'There is one God, whom we do not otherwise acknowledge, brethren, but out of the Sacred Scriptures. For as he, who would profess the wisdom of this world, cannot otherwise attain it, unless he read the doctrines of the philosophers; so whosoever will exercise piety towards God, can learn it nowhere but from the holy Scriptures³.'

¹ Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem qua mihi et Factorem manifestat et facta. In Evangelio vero amplius et ministerium et arbitrum Rectoris invenio, Sermonem. An autem de aliqua subjacenti materia facta sint omnia, nusquam adhuc legi. Scriptum esse doceat Hermogenis officina. Si non est scriptum, timeat ~~væ~~ illud *adjicientibus aut detrahentibus* destinatum.—*Adv. Hermogenem*, c. 22. See also *Apolog.* c. 47. *De Præscript.* c. 6. &c.

² In hoc biduo puto duo Testamenta posse intelligi, in quibus liceat omne verbum quod ad Deum pertinet (hoc enim est sacrificium) requiri et discuti, atque ex ipsis omnem rerum scientiam capi. Si quid autem superfuerit, quod non divina Scriptura decernat, nullam aliam tertiam Scripturam debere ad auctoritatem scientiæ suscipi. . . . Sed igni tradamus quod superest, id est, Deo reservemus. Neque enim in præsentī vita Deus scire nos omnia voluit.—Origen. *Homil. v. in Levit.*

³ Unus Deus est, quem non aliunde, fratres, agnoscimus, quam ex sanctis Scripturis. Quemadmodum enim, si quis vellet sapientiam hujus sæculi exercere, non aliter hoc consequi poterit, nisi dogmata philosophorum legat; sic quicumque volumus pietatem in Deum exercere, non aliunde

Athanasius: 'The holy and divinely-inspired Scriptures are of themselves sufficient to the enunciation of truth¹.' Again: 'These are the fountains of salvation, that he who thirsts may be satisfied with the oracles contained in them. In these alone the doctrine of salvation is contained. Let no man add to, or take from them².'

Cyril of Jerusalem says that, 'Concerning the divine and holy mysteries of the faith, even the most casual remark ought not to be delivered without the sacred Scriptures³.'

Basil: 'Believe those things, which are written; the things, which are not written, seek not⁴.' 'It is a manifest defection from the faith, and a proof of arrogance, either to reject anything of what is written, or to introduce anything that is not⁵.'

Ambrose: 'How can we use those things which we find not in the Scripture⁶?'

Jerom: 'We deny not those things which are written, so we refuse those which are not written. That God was born of a Virgin, we believe, because we read; that Mary married after she gave birth to Him, we believe not, because we read not⁷.'

discemus, quam ex Scripturis divinis.—Hippolyt. *adv. Noetum*, c. ix. *Opera*, Hamburg, 1716, Tom. i. p. 239.

¹ Αὐταρκεῖς μὲν γάρ εἰσιν αἱ ἁγίαὶ καὶ θεόπνευστοι γραφαὶ πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπαγγελίαν.—Athanas. *contra Gentes*, Tom. i. p. 1.

² Ταῦτα πηγαὶ τοῦ σωτηρίου, ὥστε τὸν διψῶντα ἐμφορεῖσθαι τῶν ἐν τούτοις λογίων· ἐν τούτοις μόνον τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας διδασκαλεῖον εὐαγγελίζεται· μηδεὶς τούτοις ἐπιβάλλετω, μὴ δὲ τούτων ἀφαιρείσθω.—*Ex Festali Epistola* xxxix. Tom. ii. p. 39. Edit. Colon.

³ Δεῖ γὰρ περὶ τῶν θείων καὶ ἁγίων τῆς πίστεως μυστηρίων μηδὲ τὸ τύχον ἄνευ τῶν θείων παραδίδοσθαι γραφῶν.—Cyril. Hierosol. *Catech.* iv. 12.

⁴ Τοῖς γεγραμμένοις πίστευε, τὰ μὴ γεγραμμένα μὴ ζήτηι.—Basil. Hom. xxix. *adv. Calumniantes S. Trin.*

⁵ Φανερὰ ἔκπτωσις πίστεως καὶ ὑπερηφανίας κατηγορία ἡ ἀθετεῖν τι τῶν γεγραμμένων ἢ ἐπείσάγειν τῶν μὴ γεγραμμένων.—Basil. *De Fide*, c. 1.

⁶ Quæ in Scripturis sanctis non reperimus, ea quemadmodum usurpare possumus.—Ambros. *Offic.* Lib. i. c. 23.

⁷ Ut hæc quæ scripta sunt non negamus, ita ea quæ non scripta sunt renuimus. Natum Deum de Virgine credimus, quia legimus. Mariam nupsisse post partum non credimus, quia non legimus.—Hieron. *adv. Hel-*

Augustine: ‘In those things which are plainly laid down in Scripture all things are found which embrace faith and morals¹.’

Vincentius Lirinensis begins with the admission, that ‘The Canon of Scripture is perfect, and most abundantly sufficient for all things².’

Theodoret: ‘Being not human reasonings and syllogisms; I rely on Scripture³.’

John Damascene: ‘All things that are delivered to us by the Law, the Prophets, the Apostles and the Evangelists we receive, acknowledge and reverence, seeking for nothing beyond these⁴.’

It can scarcely be necessary to bring more or stronger proofs, that the fathers with one voice affirm the perfection and sufficiency of the written word, for the end for which it was written, *i. e.* for a rule of faith, and for a rule of life⁵.

vidium juxta finem, Tom. II. p. 18, Paris, 1602: Tom. IV. part II. p. 141, Edit. Benedict.

¹ In iis, quæ aperte in Scriptura posita sunt, inveniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem moresque vivendi.—August. *De Doctrina Christ.* Lib. II. c. 9. Tom. III. p. 24.

In like manner:—Proinde sive de Christo, sive de ejus Ecclesia, sive de quacunque alia re quæ pertinet ad fidem vitamque vestram, non dicam nos, nequaquam comparandi ei qui dixit, Licet si nos; sed omnino quod secutus adjecit, Si angelus de cælo vobis annuntiaverit præterquam quod in Scripturis legalibus et evangelicis accepistis anathema sit.—Aug. *cont. Petilium*, Lib. III. c. 6. Tom. IX. p. 301.

² Cum sit perfectus Scripturarum Canon, sibi que ad omnia satis superque sufficiat.—Vincent. Lirin. *Commonitor.* c. 2.

³ Μή μοι λογισμούς καὶ συλλογισμούς ἀνθρώπινους προσενέγκης· ἐγὼ γὰρ μόνῃ πείθομαι τῇ θεῇ γραφῇ.—Theodoret. *Dial.* I. ΑΤΡΕΠΤ.

⁴ Πάντα τὰ παραδιδόμενα ἡμῖν διὰ τε νόμου, καὶ προφητῶν καὶ ἀποστόλων καὶ εὐαγγελιστῶν δεχόμεθα καὶ γνώσκομεν καὶ σέβομεν, οὐδὲν περαιτέρω τούτων ἐπιζητοῦντες.—Damascen. Lib. I. *De Orthodox. Fide*, c. 1.

⁵ Divines of the English Church have collected many other passages to the same purpose.—See *Laud against Fisher*, § 16; Usher's *Answer to a Jesuit*, ch. 2; Jer. Taylor, *Dissuasive from Popery*, Part II. Bk. I. ch. 2; *Rule of Conscience*, Book II. ch. II. Rule XIV. From some of which works I have taken the above passages (with one or two exceptions) merely verifying the quotations.

2 (1) But an objection will be urged to these arguments from the fathers, that some of them, and those of no mean importance, clearly speak of a rule of faith which is distinct from the Scriptures; it is, therefore, evident that they do not appeal to Scripture alone as supreme, perfect, and sufficient. Thus, without question, Irenæus spoke of a κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας, ‘a rule of truth,’ according to which he considered that the Scriptures ought to be interpreted¹. In the same manner Tertullian appeals to a *Regula Fidei*, ‘a rule of faith,’ by which he was guided in interpreting Scripture². Here are two of the earliest fathers appealing to an authority which is certainly not Scripture; and therefore they must have held that something besides Scripture was necessary, and that all things, needful for faith and practice, were not contained in Scripture.

If, however, we consult the contexts, we shall find that the rule spoken of in both these fathers is the baptismal Creed. Irenæus expressly says that the Canon of Truth, which each one was to keep, was that which was received by him at his baptism³; and in the next chapter recites a form or profession of faith which is very nearly the same as the Apostles’ Creed, and which he speaks of as that ‘faith which the Church scattered throughout the world diligently keeps⁴.’

In the very same manner Tertullian writes, ‘Now we have a rule of faith, which teaches us what we are to defend and maintain, and by that very rule we believe that there is One God,’

¹ Οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὁ τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας ἀκλιωῇ ἐν ἑαυτῷ κατέχων, ὃν διὰ βαπτίσματος εἴληφε, τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν ὀνόματα καὶ τὰς λέξεις καὶ τὰς παραβολὰς ἐπιγνώσεται.—Irenæ. i. 9.

² Hæc Regula a Christo, ut probabitur, instituta, nullas habet quæstiones, nisi quas hæreses inferunt, et quæ hæreticos faciunt.—Tertull. *De Præscript. Hæret.* c. 14.

Adversus Regulam nihil scire omnia scire.—*Ibid.*

³ See the last note but one.

⁴ Lib. i. 10.

&c.; he goes on reciting the various articles of the Creed¹. Here then we see that the rules of faith of Irenæus and Tertullian were not some independent tradition, teaching doctrines not to be found in Scripture; but the Creeds, taught to Christians, and confessed by them at their baptism, which were in fact epitomes of important Scriptural doctrine, founded on Scripture, and fully according with it. This is a widely different thing from the *Doctrina tradita* of the Church of Rome. Reliance on the latter is opposed to the sufficiency of Scripture, but the rule of Irenæus and Tertullian was based upon Scripture, and in all respects accordant with it.

Clement of Alexandria also, who is almost as early a witness as Tertullian, speaks, like Irenæus, of a κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας, ‘a rule of truth,’ which he also calls κανὼν ἐκκλησιαστικός. But this rule, so far from being something apart from, and of parallel authority with Scripture, is, according to Clement, founded on a harmony of the old Testament with the new, ‘The ecclesiastical rule,’ says he, ‘is the harmony of the Law and the Prophets with the Covenant delivered by the Lord during His presence on earth².’

A like sense we must attach to the language of the later fathers, when we find them speaking of a *Regula Fidei*. They considered the fundamental doctrines of the faith, those, that is, contained in the Creeds, to be the great guide for Christians in interpreting Scriptures. Whosoever erred from these erred from the truth; and in explaining obscure passages, they held that it was very needful to keep in view the necessity of not deviating from the great lines of truth marked out in the baptismal Creeds. This was not to add to Scripture, but to guard it against being wrested to destruction³.

¹ *De Præscript. Hæret.* c. 13.

² Κανὼν δὲ ἐκκλησιαστικός ἡ συνφθία καὶ ἡ συμφωνία νόμου τε καὶ προφητῶν τῇ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου παρουσίαν παραδιδόμενη διαθήκη.—*Strom.* Lib. vi. c. 15. ed. Potter, p. 803.

³ See Bp. Marsh, *On the Interpretation of the Bible*, Lect. xi.; Bp. Kaye's

(2) But, it may be said, Irenæus, Tertullian, and others, not only appealed to tradition, but even preferred arguing from tradition to arguing from Scripture.

Tertullian especially says: 'No appeal must be made to the Scriptures, no contest must be founded on them; in which victory is uncertain.... The grand question is, to whom the Faith itself belongs; in whose hands were the Scriptures deposited.... to whom that doctrine was first committed, whereby we are made Christians? For wherever this true doctrine and discipline shall appear to be, there the truth of the Scripture and of the interpretation of it will be, and of Christian tradition¹.'

The meaning, however, of this appeal to tradition in preference to Scripture, both by Irenæus and Tertullian, is this: Both were reasoning against heretics. Those heretics mutilated Scripture, and perverted it. When, therefore, the fathers found their appeal to Scripture of no effect, partly because the heretics were ready to deny that what they quoted was Scripture, and partly because they were ready to evade its force by false glosses and perverted interpretations, then the fathers saw that to reason from Scripture was not convincing to their opponents, and therefore had recourse to the doctrine preserved by the Apostolical Churches, which, they maintained, were not likely to have lost or to have corrupted the truth first entrusted to them. It was not that they themselves doubted the sufficiency of Scripture, but that they found other weapons useful against the gainsayers, and therefore brought tradition, not to add to, but to confirm Scripture².

The same may be said concerning the famous work of Vincentius Lirinensis. He begins by admitting that 'Scripture is perfect and abundantly of itself sufficient for all things.' But

Tertullian, p. 290, &c.; Bp. Kaye's *Clement of Alexandria*, p. 366; Beaven's *Irenæus*, ch. VIII.

¹ *De Præscript. Hæret.* c. 19.

² See Beaven's *Irenæus*, p. 136; Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, p. 297, note.

because various heretics have misinterpreted it, Novatian expounding it one way, Photinus in another, Sabellius in another, and so on: 'therefore,' he says, 'very necessary it is for the avoiding of such turnings and twinings of error, that the line of interpreting the Prophets and Apostles be directed according to the rule of Ecclesiastical and Catholic sense¹.' This is not to introduce a new rule independent of Scripture. It is at most a *Traditio Hermeneutica*, a rule for the interpreting of Scripture. It still leaves Scripture as the fountain of truth, though it guards against using its streams for other than legitimate purposes.

Finally, we have seen the concurrent testimony of the fathers to be in favour of the sufficiency of Scripture. If, here and there, a single passage be apparently unfavourable to this testimony, we must hold it to be a private opinion of an individual father, and therefore not worthy of being esteemed in comparison with their general consent. For it is a rule of Vincentius himself, that 'Whatsoever any, although a learned man, a bishop, a martyr, or a confessor holds, otherwise than all, or against all, this must be put aside from the authority of the general judgment, and be reputed merely his own private opinion².'

¹ *Commonitor.* c. 2.

² *Commonitor.* c. 28. On the true sense of the perfection of Scripture, see Hooker, *E. P.* I. xiii. xiv. II. viii. 5.

SECTION II.

ON THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE¹.

AS Scripture is determined by our Church to be the final appeal and only infallible authority concerning matters of faith and practice, it becomes next a subject of the deepest importance to determine what is Scripture and what is not. And, as this subject is so important, we naturally look for an authority of the highest kind to settle and determine it. We value, indeed, the decisions of antiquity, we respect the judgment of the primitive Church. But on the question, What is the Word of God? we would, if possible, have an authority as infallible as the Word of God; and, if we can have such authority, we can be satisfied with nothing less.

Now such an authority we believe that we possess; and that we possess it in this way: Christ Himself gave His own Divine sanction to the Jewish Canon of the old Testament; and He gave His own authority to His Apostles to write the new. If this statement be once admitted, we have only to investigate historically what was the Jewish Canon, and what were the books written by the Apostles. We need search no farther; we shall greatly confirm our faith by the witness of fathers and councils; but, if Christ has spoken, we need no other, as we can have no higher warrant.

¹ The word *κάνων* signifies a line, or rule—a standard, therefore, by which other things are to be judged of. It is applied to the *tongue of a balance*, or that small part of the scales, which by its perpendicular situation determines the even poise or weight, or by its inclination either way the uneven poise of the things that are weighed. It is applied to the Scriptures, because they have ever been esteemed in the Church ‘the infallible rule of our faith, and the perfect square of our actions, in all things that are in any way needful for our eternal salvation.’—Cosin’s *Scholastical Hist. of the Canon*, Chap. I.; Jones, *On the Canon*, ch. I.

I. Now, first, we have to consider the question of the *old Testament*, and our inquiry is, Has our Lord Himself stamped with His authority certain books, and left others unauthorized? The answer is, He has. We must not, indeed, argue from the fact of His quoting a certain number of books and leaving a certain number unquoted; for there are six books which can be proved to be Canonical, which the writers of the new Testament never quoted: viz. Judges, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Ecclesiastes, Solomon's Song. The fact that these books are not quoted will not destroy their authority; for we have no reason to say that our Lord or His Apostles quoted systematically from all the Canonical books in order to establish their canonicity. But the way in which our Lord has given His own sanction to a certain definite number of books, is this: In speaking to the Jews both He and His Apostles constantly address them as having the Scriptures—Scriptures of Divine authority,—and able to make them wise unto salvation. They never hint that the Jewish Canon is imperfect or excessive, and hence they plainly shew that the Scriptures, which the Jews possessed and acknowledged, were the truly Canonical Scriptures of the old Testament. Our Lord bids them 'Search the Scriptures,' and adds, 'they are they which testify of Me,' (John v. 39). St. Paul says that the greatest privilege of the Jews was that 'unto them were committed the Oracles of God,' (Rom. iii. 2); and tells Timothy that 'from a child he had known the Scriptures, which were able to make him wise unto salvation,' (2 Tim. iii. 16). Accordingly, our Lord constantly appeals to those Scriptures, as well-known and universally-received books among the Jews, to whom He spoke, quoting them as, 'It is written,' or asking concerning them, 'How readest thou?' Though the Jews are charged with many errors, with corrupting the truth by tradition, and adding to it the commandments of man, yet nowhere are they charged with corrupting Scripture, with having rejected some, or added other

books to the Canon. But it is ever plainly implied that the Canon which they then possessed was the true Canon of the old Testament. Thus, then, by quoting, referring to, arguing from, the old Testament, as it was then received by the Jews, our Lord stamps with His own supreme authority the Jewish Canon of the old Testament Scriptures. We have only further to determine from history what the Jewish Canon, at the time of our Saviour's teaching, was, and we have all that we can need. If history will satisfy us of this, we have no more to ask.

Now the only difficulty lies here. There appear to be two different books claiming to be the Jewish Scriptures; viz. the Hebrew Bibles, now in the hands both of Jews and Christians, and the Septuagint. The latter contains all the books contained in the former, with the addition of the books commonly called the Apocrypha.

Let us first observe, that the modern Jews universally acknowledge no other Canon but the Hebrew; which corresponds accurately with the Canon of the English Church. Those who know the fidelity with which for centuries the Jews have guarded their text, will consider this alone to be a strong argument, that the Hebrew Canon is the same as that cited by our Lord. Every verse, every word, every letter, of Scripture is numbered by them. Every large and every small letter, every letter irregularly written, above the line or below the line, is taken notice of and scrupulously preserved.

But we can go back to more ancient times, and shew that the Canon of the Jews has always been the same. The Babylonian Talmud recounts the same books we have now; viz. In the Law, the five books of Moses; among the Prophets, Joshua and Judges, Samuel and Kings, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets; in the Chethubim, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs,

Lamentations, Daniel, Esther, Chronicles. This was the Canon of the Jewish Church about A.D. 550.¹

But 150 years earlier than this, Jerom undertook the task of translating the Hebrew Scriptures into Latin. Theretofore all the Latin translations had been from the Septuagint, and therefore contained all the Apocryphal books. Jerom, the first of the Latin fathers who could read Hebrew, when undertaking this important labour, was naturally led to examine into the Canon of the Hebrew Scriptures. He informs us that the Jews had two and twenty books in their Bible, corresponding with the two and twenty Hebrew letters. This number they made by classing two books together as one; thus, the two books of Samuel were one, the two books of Kings, Ezra and Nehemiah, Jeremiah and Lamentations, Judges and Ruth, respectively, were considered as one each. The books were divided into three classes, the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa. The first contained the five books of Moses; the second contained Joshua, Judges and Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Lamentations, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor Prophets; the third contained Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, Job, Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah, Esther, Chronicles. The Law, therefore, contained five books, the Prophets eight, the Hagiographa nine².

To go still farther back, Origen, who was born A.D. 184 and who died A.D. 255, and who, like Jerom, was learned in Hebrew and gave great attention to the Hebrew text, (as is well known from his famous work, the *Hexapla*), enumerates the same books that Jerom does, except that he adds after all

¹ Baba Bathra, fol. 14. col. 2. The books of Moses are called תּוֹרָה The Law: the prophetical books נְבִיאִים The Prophets: the other books כְּתוּבִים Chethubim, i. e. The Scriptures or Writings.

² Hieron. *Prologus Galeatus*, Op. Tom. iii. p. 23, Paris, 1602.

the rest, that there was the book Maccabees apart or distinct from the others¹.

Still earlier, Melito, bishop of Sardis, made a journey into the East, for the sake of inquiring what were the books held Canonical there, and, in a letter to Onesimus, gives a catalogue of these books, precisely corresponding with the present Canon of the Hebrew Scriptures, except that he classes Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, under the common name of Esdras². This father lived about the year 160.

We next come to Josephus. He flourished at the time of the siege of Jerusalem, and was therefore contemporary with the Apostles. In the first place, we find the same threefold division in his writings which occurs in Jerom, and has ever since been common with the Jews: viz. the Law, the Prophets, and other books, which he characterizes as 'Hymns and Instructions for Men's Lives.' A similar division exists in Philo³. But Josephus, moreover, divides the Scriptures, as Jerom testifies that the Jews did in his time, into twenty-two books⁴. The only difference between the divisions of Josephus and Jerom is, that, whereas Jerom says there were eight in the Prophets and nine in the Hagiographa, Josephus assigns thirteen to the Prophets, and four to the Hagiographa. We know, however, that the Jews have gradually been augmenting the number of the books in the Hagiographa and diminishing the number in the Prophets, so that there is no great wonder if, between the first and the fourth century, there was such

¹ Ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25: "Ἐξω δὲ τούτων εἰσὶ τὰ Μακκαβαϊκὰ, ἅπερ ἐπιγέγραπται Σαρβῆθ Σαρβανιέλ. Bishop Cosin interprets this, as meaning that the Books of Maccabees were 'out of the Canon.'—*History of the Canon*, ch. v.

² Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 26. See Bp. Cosin as above, ch. iv.

³ *De Vita Contemplativa*, Tom. ii. p. 475; Marsh, *On the Authority of the old Testament*, Lect. xxxii.

⁴ *Contra Apion.* i. § 8; Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 10.

a change in their mode of reckoning, that in the first they reckoned thirteen, in the fourth but eight among prophetic books.

Thus then, since we find that Josephus gives the same threefold division which we find afterwards given by Jerom, and also that he gives the same total number of books, viz. twenty-two, though somewhat differently distributed, we might at once naturally conclude, that the Jewish Canon in the time of Josephus was the same with the Jewish Canon in the time of Jerom. That is to say, we might conclude that it embraced the books now in the Hebrew Bibles and in the Canon of the English Church, and that it excluded the Apocryphal books, which the English Church excludes. But, if we could doubt that this was the case, his own words might set us at rest; for he tells us that the books belonging to the second class (i.e. to the Prophets) were written previously to the reign (or to the death) of Artaxerxes Longimanus, and that, though books were written after that time, 'they were not esteemed worthy of the same credit with those before them, because there was no longer the exact succession of the Prophets¹.' It was during the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus that the book of Esther was written, Artaxerxes being, according to Josephus, the Ahasuerus of that book². This would therefore be the last book of his Canon. All the Apocryphal books must have been written long after that reign, and therefore cannot be included in his twenty-two books, compared with which they were not thought worthy of equal credit. It is plain, therefore, that the Canon of Josephus must be the same with that of Jerom.

Now, in the short time which elapsed between our Saviour's

¹ Ἀπὸ δὲ Ἀρταξέρξου μέχρι τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνου, γέγραπται μὲν ἕκαστα· πίστεως δὲ οὐχ ὁμοίας ἡξίωται τοῖς πρὸ αὐτῶν, διὰ τὸ μὴ γενέσθαι τὴν τῶν προφητῶν ἀκριβῆ διαδοχὴν.—*Contra Apionem*, i. § 8; *Euseb. H. E.* iii. 10.

² *Antiq. Lib.* xi. cap. 6.

earthly ministry and Josephus, no alteration can have taken place in the Canon. Josephus himself tells us, that a copy of the Hebrew Scriptures was preserved in the Temple¹. And, therefore, until the destruction of the Temple, when Josephus was thirty-three years old, that Temple copy existed, and was a protection against all change. He would have had easy access to that Temple copy, and hence is a fully competent witness to its contents. Nay, even without the existence of that copy, which was an invaluable security, we learn from Philo, that in his time the Jews had the same intense veneration for the words of Scripture which we know them to have had afterwards, so that nothing would induce them 'to alter one word, and that they would rather die ten thousand deaths, than suffer any alteration in their laws and statutes².'

We now are arrived at the period when the books of the new Testament were written. Philo and Josephus were in fact contemporaries of Christ and His Apostles. We have already seen that our Lord and the Apostles quote the Scriptures as well known and universally received, and never hint at their corruption. Our Lord indeed divides them (as we see they were divided by Jerom and the Jews ever since) into three distinct classes, which our Lord calls the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms³, in which 'the Psalms' is put for the whole Hagiographa, either because the Psalms stood first among the

¹ Δηλοῦται διὰ τῶν ἀνακειμένων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ γραμμάτων.—*Antiq. Lib. v. cap. 17.*

² Philo-Judæus *ap. Euseb. Præpar. Evangel. Lib. viii. § 6*: Μὴ ῥῆμα γ' αὐτοὺς μόνον τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένων κινήσαι, ἀλλὰ κἄν μυρίακίς αὐτοὺς ἀποθανεῖν ὑπομεῖναι θάττον τοῖς ἐκείνου νόμοις καὶ ἔθεσιν ἐναντία πεισθῆναι. See Cosin, *On the Canon*, ch. II.

So Josephus: Δῆλον δ' ἔστιν ἔργῳ πῶς ἡμεῖς τοῖς ἰδίῳις γράμμασι πεπιστεύκαμεν· τοσούτου γὰρ αἰῶνος ἤδη παρφηκός οὔτε προσθεῖναι τις οὐδὲν, οὔτε ἀφελεῖν αὐτῶν, οὔτε μεταθεῖναι τετόλμηκεν.—*Contra Apionem*, I. § 8; Euseb. *H. E.* III. 10.

³ 'That all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms.'—Luke xxiv. 44.

books of the Hagiographa, or because the Hagiographa may be said to consist chiefly of hymns and poems, which might well be called Psalms¹. We have to add to this, that in the new Testament every book of the Jewish Canon is distinctly quoted, with the exception of six, and those perhaps the six least likely to have furnished passages for quotation; but not one quotation occurs from any one of those books, which form a part of what is now called the Apocrypha².

If we could carry the evidence no farther we might rest satisfied here, that our Lord gave His sanction to the Hebrew, not to the Septuagint Canon. But we can go one step farther; and it is this: One hundred and thirty years before our Lord's birth, the Prologue of the Book of Ecclesiasticus was written, which classes the Hebrew Scriptures into the same three classes, 'the Law, the Prophets, and the other books of the fathers.' This is a ground for believing that the Jewish Scriptures were the same in number then that they were found to be afterwards. Again, what is not a little important, Targums³, some of which are as old or older than the Christian era, were made from all the books of the old Testament, but none are to be found of the Apocryphal books. We have Targums of the Law, Targums of the Prophets, Targums of the Chethubim, but no Targums of the Apocrypha.

Our evidence is now pretty nearly complete; we may recapitulate it thus. We have the threefold division of the

¹ According to the division which existed in our Saviour's time, which probably was the same as that in the time of Josephus, there would have been but four books in the Chethubim or Hagiographa, viz. Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Solomon's Song.

² See this proved.—Cosin, *Hist. of Canon*, ch. iii.

³ The Targums were translations or paraphrases of the Scriptures, made from the original Hebrew into Chaldee, when Hebrew had become a dead language, which was the case soon after the return from captivity. They were read in the synagogues, and formed the ordinary instruments for instruction of the Jews of Palestine in the Scriptures.

Scriptures mentioned—in the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus, by Philo, by our blessed Lord, by Josephus; and the same we find in the time of Jerom and among all the Jews from that time to this.

We know that the number of books contained in these three classes was, in the time of Josephus, twenty-two. The same number we find recounted by Origen and Jerom, as belonging to the Jewish Canon, and Origen and Jerom give us their names, which are the names of the books in the present Jewish Canon.

The Canon in the time of Josephus, who was born A. D. 37, must have been the same as that in the time of Christ; as its security was guaranteed by the existence of the Temple copy, to say nothing of the scrupulous fidelity of the Jews, who, as Philo tells us, would have died ten thousand times, rather than alter one word.

The Targums, which are paraphrases of the books in the present Hebrew Canon, confirm the same inference, and some of them are as old as the time of our Lord.

Now we know exactly how the threefold division embraced the books of the Hebrew Canon. We know how, in Origen's time and in Jerom's time, the twenty-two books (which was also the number in Josephus' time) embraced the books of the Hebrew Canon. We know too that Melito, less than 100 years after Josephus, gave, as the books received in the East, a catalogue corresponding exactly with the same Hebrew Canon. But no imaginable ingenuity can ever make the books of the Apocrypha fit into any of these divisions, or agree with any of these lists.

When we add to this, that our Lord and His Apostles, when they give the sanction of Divine authority to the Jewish Scriptures, quote perpetually nearly all the books of the Hebrew Canon, and quote none besides, no link in the chain seems wanting to prove that the Jewish Canon is that to which

Christ appealed, and which He has commended to us as the Word of God.

The history of the Septuagint explains the only difficulty in the question. It is briefly as follows:

In the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus this version was made at Alexandria. It is impossible that it could have then contained the books of the Apocrypha, insamuch as these books were not written till after the date when the Septuagint version was made; none of them probably having been in existence till about two centuries before the Christian era. At what exact time the Apocryphal books were written respectively, it is not easy to determine. None of them could have been written in Hebrew, which had then become a dead language; though some may have been composed in Chaldee or Syriac, languages which in the new Testament and in other writings are frequently called Hebrew¹. However, when these Apocryphal books were written, if in Greek, the originals, if in Chaldee, the Greek translations, were, in all probability, inserted into the Septuagint, along with the still more sacred books of Scripture, by the Alexandrian Jews, who, in their state of dispersion, were naturally zealous about all that concerned their religion and the history of their race. The places which they assigned to the various books, were dependent either on the subject or on the supposed author. Thus the Song of

¹ The Book of Ecclesiasticus appears from ch. l. 27 to have been written by 'Jesus the Son of Sirach of *Jerusalem*;' and in the Prologue of his grandson the words of the book are said to have been 'Εβραϊστὶ λεγόμενα, written in Hebrew. However, Hebrew was then a dead language, and the Jews spoke Syro-Chaldee, which was what St. Paul spoke when he addressed his countrymen 'in the Hebrew dialect,' ἐν Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ, Acts xxii. 1. It is also said that the first book of Maccabees was written in Hebrew, but as some of the events recorded in it happened within 150 years from the birth of Christ, it must have been the same Chaldee. Tobit also and Judith are said by Jerom, in his Prefaces to these books, to have been written *Chaldaeo sermone*, though it has been thought the Chaldee was only a translation.

the three Children, the Story of Susanna, and the History of Bel and the Dragon seemed connected with, and were therefore added to, the book of Daniel. The Greek Esdras seemed naturally to be connected with the Greek translation of the book of Ezra. The book of Wisdom, being called the Wisdom of Solomon, was added to the Song of Solomon; and the book of Ecclesiasticus, called the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, was placed after the Wisdom of Solomon.

No doubt the Alexandrian Jews ascribed great importance to the books which they thus inserted in the Septuagint version; but Philo, who was an Alexandrian Jew, and who was a contemporary of our Lord's, never quotes them for the purpose of establishing any doctrine; and it is certain that they none of them ever got into the Hebrew Canon; nor were ever received by the Jews of Palestine, amongst whom our blessed Saviour taught, and to whose Canon, therefore, He gave the sanction of His Divine authority.

Now the fathers of the Christian Church, for the first three centuries, were, with the exception of Origen, profoundly ignorant of Hebrew. It was natural therefore that they should have adopted the Greek version as their old Testament; and accordingly it formed the original of their Latin version. Hence the books of the old Testament current in the Church, were in Greek the Septuagint, in Latin a translation from the Greek Septuagint; both therefore containing the Apocryphal books. It was not till the time of Jerom that a translation was made from the Hebrew; and hence, in the eyes of many, the whole collection of books contained in the Septuagint and the old Latin translation was naturally viewed with the respect due to Scripture. Many indeed of the fathers, as we shall soon see, knew the difference between the books of the Hebrew Canon and those of the Apocrypha; and knew that the former were Divine, the latter of inferior authority. But still many quoted almost indiscriminately from both; and especially St. Augustine is

appealed to as having given a Catalogue of the old Testament Scriptures, which contained the books of Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and the two books of Maccabees¹. In the Latin Church the name of Augustine stood deservedly high. Though Jerome's labours shewed the fallacy of Augustine's opinion, though the Greek fathers never received the Apocryphal books so carelessly as the Latin fathers had done, and though even Augustine himself was aware of the difference between them and the books of the Hebrew Canon, yet the Apocryphal books still kept their place in the Latin Vulgate, and were ultimately adopted by the Council of Trent, as part of the Canon of Scripture. Yet as we can thus easily trace the origin of the mistake, and thereby see that it was mistake, we need not be led away with it.

This, necessarily very brief, sketch of the grounds on which we believe the present Hebrew Canon to be that to which our Lord gave His sanction, may be sufficient to shew on what we rest our belief concerning the sacred books of the old Testament. From such historical evidence we know that the Scriptures, which the Lord Jesus appealed to, authorized, and confirmed, were the books contained in our Hebrew Bibles². We ask no more, and we can receive no more. On such a matter the appeal to such an authority must be final. Fathers and Councils, nay, 'the holy Church throughout all the world,' would be as nothing, if their voice could be against their Lord's.

We are not, however, in this or in any other question, insensible to the value of the opinions of the fathers, still less of the consent of the early Church. And though we can plainly see what, in this case, may have led some of the fathers into error,

¹ Augustin. *De Doctrina Christiana*, Lib II. c. 8; *Opera*, Tom. III. Pt. I. p. 23.

² Passages of the new Testament, where such authority is given to the old, are such as Matt. v. 18. Luke xvi. 29; xxiv. 27, 44. John v. 39. Rom. iii. 1, 2; ix. 4. 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16.

we rejoice in being able to shew that, in the main, their testimony is decisive for what we have already, on other grounds, shewn to be the truth.

Now in the second century, A. D. 147, Justin Martyr, himself a native of Palestine, in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, though he reproves him for many other things, never reproaches him for rejecting any of the Canonical Scriptures¹. Melito, A. D. 160, we have already seen, went to Palestine to be satisfied concerning the Canon of the old Testament, and reports that it contained, according to the Christians of that country, the books of our Hebrew Bible². Origen, A. D. 220, the most learned of the early fathers, the famous compiler of the Hexapla, himself a native of and resident at Alexandria, where the Septuagint Version was made and received, gives us the same account as Melito³.

Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, A. D. 340, gives a perfect catalogue of the books of Scripture, enumerating the books of the old Testament just as the English Church receives them now, and mentioning as *not canonical*⁴ the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Sirach, Esther (*i. e.* the Apocryphal book of Esther), Judith and Tobit⁵.

Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers in France, A. D. 350, numbers the books of the old Testament as twenty-two, and gives the

¹ Cosin, *On the Canon*, ch. iv.

² Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 26.

³ Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25.

⁴ Ἑτέρα βιβλία τούτων ἔξωθεν οὐ κανονιζόμενα μὲν, τετυπωμένα δὲ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων.

⁵ *Festal. Epist.* xxxix. *Op.* Tom. ii. p. 961, edit. Bened. Tom. ii. p. 38. Colon. 1686.

The only thing to be observed in the catalogue of Athanasius is, that he joins Baruch and the Epistle with Jeremiah; into which mistake many of the fathers fell, from the connexion which was made between those books in the LXX. and Latin; though some think that nothing more is meant than what is inserted in the book of Jeremiah concerning Baruch, and the Epistle contained in the twenty-ninth chapter of the prophecy of Jeremiah—not the Apocryphal books of these names.—See Cosin, ch. vi.

names of the very books of the Hebrew Bible used in the English Church; saying, that some persons had added to this number Tobit and Judith, to make up twenty-four, the number of the Greek letters, instead of twenty-two, the number of the Hebrew¹.

Cyril of Jerusalem, A. D. 360, in his Catechetical Lectures, exhorts the catechumens to abstain from the Apocryphal, and to read only the Canonical books of Scripture; giving as the reason, 'Why shouldest thou, who knowest not those which are acknowledged by all, take needless trouble about those which are questioned?' He makes the number of the books twenty-two, and gives the same list as Athanasius, i. e. the same as the English Canon, with the addition of Baruch and the Epistle to the book of Jeremiah².

The Council of Laodicea, held about A. D. 364, in its fifty-ninth Canon, gives exactly the same list as Athanasius and Cyril. The Canons of this Council were approved by name in the sixth general Council, of Constantinople in Trullo³.

Epiphanius, Bishop of Constance in Cyprus, A. D. 374, three times numbers the books of the old Testament, as we do; and mentions the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus as 'doubtful writings,' and not counted as among the sacred books 'because they were never laid up in the Ark of the Covenant⁴.'

Gregory Nazianzen, A. D. 376, gives a catalogue which is the same as the Canon of the English Church, except that he does not mention Esther, which he probably includes in Ezra⁵.

¹ Hilar. *Proleg. in Librum Psalmorum*, § 15. edit. Benedict. p. 9. His catalogue is five books of Moses, 5. Joshua, 1. Judges and Ruth, 1. Samuel, 1. Kings, 1. Chronicles, 1. Ezra (including Nehemiah), 1. Psalms, 1. Proverbs, 1. Ecclesiastes, 1. Song of Songs, 1. Minor Prophets, 1. Isaiah, 1. Jeremiah (with Lamentations and Epistle) 1. Daniel, 1. Ezekiel, 1. Job, 1. Esther, 1. In all, 22.

² Cyril. Hieros. *Catech.* iv. § 35.

³ Concil. Laodicen. Can. LIX. Concil. Quinisext. Can. II.

⁴ *Adv. Hæres.* v. LXXVI. *De Mensuris et Ponderibus*, Tom. II. pp. 162, 180.

⁵ Greg. Nazianz. *Carm.* XXXIII.

Ruffinus, presbyter of Aquileia, A. D. 398, numbers the books of the old Testament as the English Church does at present¹.

Jerom, the contemporary and friend of Ruffinus, gives us, as we have seen, the same catalogue as the Church of England now receives, and enumerates Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Judith, Tobit and the Maccabees, as Apocryphal books².

We have now arrived at the close of the fourth century, and have found that the whole chain of evidence up to that period is in favour, and most decidedly in favour, of the Canon of the English Church. It will be no argument against such testimony, that many of the fathers quote the Apocryphal books, or even quote them as if of authority. We have already seen what circumstances led the early Christians, and especially those of the Latin Church, into a somewhat excessive respect for the Apocryphal writings, contained in the Septuagint and the ancient Latin Versions.

At the end of the fourth century, and contemporary with Jerom, lived Augustine, Bishop of Hippo. In his book *De Doctrina Christiana*³, he enumerates the books of the 'whole Canon of Scripture.' He reckons in this Canon the books of Tobit, Judith, two books of Maccabees, Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus. The authority of Augustine is very great. Yet is it not for a moment to be weighed against the testimony of the four preceding centuries, even if his testimony was undoubted and uniform. Yet this is by no means the case. In the very passage above referred to he speaks of a diversity of opinion concerning the sacred books, and advises that those should be preferred which were received by all the Churches; that, of those not always received, those which the greater number and more important Churches received, should be preferred

¹ *Expositio in Symbolum Apostolorum*, § 36. *Ad Calcem Oper. Cyprian.*

² *In Prologo Galeato*, Tom. III. p. 23, Paris. 1602.

³ Lib. II. c. 8, edit. Benedict. Tom. III. p. 23.

before those which were sanctioned by fewer and less authoritative Churches¹. But moreover, passages from his other writings tell strongly against the canonicity of the books commonly called the Apocrypha. Thus he speaks of the Jews being without prophets from the captivity, and after the death of Malachi, Haggai, Zechariah and Ezra, until Christ². He tells us, that 'the Jews did not receive the book of Maccabees, as they did the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms, to which the Lord gives testimony, as to His own witnesses³.' He tells us that the book of Judith was never in the Canon of the Jews⁴. He distinguishes between the books, which are certainly Solomon's, and the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, to which custom has given the sanction of his name, but which learned men agreed were not his⁵. And many other proofs have been brought from his works, to shew that he was at least doubtful concerning the authority of these books, notwithstanding his catalogue which included them⁶.

We now come to the Council of Carthage, at which it is said that Augustine was present. The date of this Council is

¹ In canonicis autem Scripturis, Ecclesiarum Catholicarum quam plurimum auctoritatem sequatur; inter quas sane illæ sint quæ Apostolicas sedes habere et epistolas accipere meruerunt. Tenebit igitur hunc modum in Scripturis canonicis, ut eas, quæ ab omnibus accipiuntur Ecclesiis Catholicis, præponat eis quas quædam non accipiunt: in eis vero quæ non accipiuntur ab omnibus, præponat eas quas plures gravioresque accipiunt, eis quas pauciores minorisque auctoritatis Ecclesiæ tenent.—*Ibid.*

² *De Civitat. Dei*, Lib. xvii. cap. 24. Tom. vii. p. 487. Toto illo tempore ex quo redierant de Babylonia, post Malachiam, Aggæum, et Zachariam, qui tunc prophetaverunt, et Esdram non habuerunt prophetas usque ad Salvatoris adventum, &c.

³ *Contra Gaud.* Lib. i. c. 31. § 38. Tom. ix. p. 655.

⁴ *De Civitate Dei*, Lib. xviii. c. 26. Tom. vii. p. 508. In libro Judith: quem sane in Canone Scripturarum Judæi non recepisse dicuntur.

⁵ *De Civit. Dei*, Lib. xvii. c. 20. Tom. vii. p. 483. Propter eloquii nonnullam similitudinem, ut Salomonis dicantur, obtinuit consuetudo: non autem esse ipsius, non dubitant doctiores.

⁶ The whole question is fully sifted by Bp. Cosin, *Scholastical History of the Canon*, ch. vii.

disputed. It is usually considered as the third Council of Carthage, held A. D. 397. It enumerates the books of Scripture as we have them now, together with Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, and two books of Maccabees¹. If Augustine was present, it is probable that we ought to interpret the decree of the Council with the same restrictions with which we plainly ought to interpret the words of St Augustine, who, if he be not altogether inconsistent with himself, must assign a lower degree of authority to the doubtful books than to those which all received. But if it be not so, we must still remember that the Council of Carthage was a provincial, not a general Synod; that it was liable to err; and that in matter of history, if not in matter of doctrine, it actually did err: for by numbering five books of Solomon, it assigned to his authorship Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, which could not have been written for centuries after his death. We cannot therefore bow to the authority of the Council of Carthage, even if that of St. Augustine be joined to it, against the testimony of all preceding ages, and, above all, against what has been shewn to be the witness of our Lord Himself.

The Council of Trent, however, in its fourth session, stamped with its authority all the books which had been enumerated by the Council of Carthage, with the addition of the book of Baruch: and added an anathema against every one who should not receive the whole Canon so put forth, and all the traditions of the Church besides². Thus did the Churches of the Roman

¹ Conc. Carthag. III. Can. XLVII.

² Concil. Trid. Sess. IV. Decret. I. *Sacrorum vero librorum indicem huic decreto adscribendum censuit, ne cui dubitatio suboriri possit, quinam sint, qui ab ipso Synodo suscipiuntur. Sunt vero infra scripti:*

Test. V. Quinque Mosis, Jos., Judic., Ruth, 4 Reg., 2 Paralip., Esdræ 1 et 2 (qui dicitur Nehem.), Tobias, Judith, Esther, Job, Psalterium David. cl. Psal., Parab., Ecclesiastes, Cantic. Canticorum, Sapientia, Ecclesiasticus, Esaias, Hieremias cum Baruch, Ezech., Daniel., 12 Proph. Minores, Duo Machabæorum 1 et 2.

communion set themselves against the Churches of God in the times of old, and against all the rest of Christendom in this present time. They, by implication, condemned those ancient fathers, who, as, we have seen, almost with one voice preferred the Jewish Scriptures to the Apocryphal writings of the Septuagint. They anathematized not only the Anglican and all other reformed Churches, but as well the ancient Churches of the East, who with us reject the Apocrypha, and adhere to the Scriptures, which were sanctioned by the Lord¹. We might speak more strongly of the danger of ‘cursing whom God hath not cursed,’ but we may rest satisfied with the assurance, that ‘the curse causeless shall not come².’

II. The Canon of the new Testament rests on the same authority as the Canon of the old.

As regards the number of books which are to be admitted as Canonical in the new Testament, there is no difference between the Anglican and any other branch of the Church of Christ. Yet on the mode of settling the Canon there is some

Test. N. Quattuor Evangelia, &c. &c.

Si quis autem libros ipsos integros cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in Ecclesia Catholica legi convenerunt, et in veteri vulgata Latina editione habentur, pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit, et traditiones prædictas sciens et prudens contempserit, anathema sit.

¹ See Suicer, s. v. *γραφῆ*. See also Dr. Wordsworth's *Lectures on the Canon*, Appendix B. No. iv., where documents are given, shewing the agreement of the Eastern with the Anglican Church on the Canon of Scripture.

² On the Canon of the old Testament, see Suicer's *Thesaurus*, s. v. *γραφῆ*; Bp. Cosin's *Scholastic History of the Canon*; Bp. Marsh, *Lectures*, Part vi. *on the Authority of the old Testament*; Bp. Marsh's *Comparative View*, chap. v. Dr. Wordsworth, in his *Hulsean Lectures on the Canon of Scripture*, has thrown into the Appendix the most important passages on the subject from the Jewish and early Christian writers, in a form more convenient than they may be seen in Bp. Cosin's most valuable work, as in the latter they are scattered through the notes, whilst in Dr. Wordsworth's book they are given in a compact form at the end.

difference. The Roman Church holds that we receive the Scriptures, both of the old and new Testament, simply on the *authority* of the Church. It is said, that the Canon was not fixed till the end of the fourth century; and it is inferred that the Church then, by its plenary authority, determined which books were Scripture, and which were not. Thus virtually the Church has been made to hold a position superior to the Scriptures, as not only 'a witness and keeper,' but also a judge 'of Holy Writ.' And though, in the first instance, such authority is conceded to the Church of the fourth century, yet, by implication and consequence, the same authority is claimed for the Church of this day, that is, not for the Church Universal, but for that portion of it which has claimed, as its exclusive title, the name of Catholic, that is, the Church of Rome.

On the other hand, some Protestants have been satisfied to rest the authority of the books of the new Testament on internal evidence, especially on the witness which the Spirit bears with our own spirits that they are the Word of God. The framers of the Belgic Confession, for instance, distinctly assert that they receive the Scriptures, 'not so much because the Church receives and sanctions them as Canonical, as because the Spirit witnesses with our consciences that they proceeded from God: and especially because they, of themselves, attest their own authority and sanctity¹.'

Now the Church of England rejects altogether neither the authority of the Church, nor the internal testimony of the Scriptures. Yet she is not satisfied to rest her faith solely on the authoritative decree of any council in the fourth or fifth, still

¹ Idque non tam quod Ecclesia illos pro canonicis recipiat et comprobet: quam quod Spiritus Sanctus nostris conscientiis testetur illos a Deo emanasse: et eo maxime quod ipsi etiam per se sacram hanc suam auctoritatem et sanctitatem testentur atque comprobent.—*Confess. Belgica*, Art. v.; *Sylloge Confessionum*, p. 328; Jones, *On the Canon*, Part I. ch. vi.

less in any later century: neither can she consent to forego all external testimony, and trust to an internal witness alone; knowing that as Satan can transform himself into an angel of light, so it is possible, that what seems the guidance of God's Spirit may, if not proved, be really the suggestion of evil spirits. Hence we think that there is need of the external word, and of the Church, to teach; lest what seems a light within be but darkness counterfeiting light: and we know that the fertile source of almost every fanatical error, recorded in history, has been a reliance on inward illumination, to the neglect of outward testimony¹.

The principle then, which we assert, is this, that Christ gave authority to His Apostles to teach and to write, that He promised them infallible guidance, and that therefore all Apostolical writings are divinely inspired. We have only to inquire what writings were Apostolical; and for this purpose we have recourse to testimony, or, if the word be preferred, to tradition. The testimony or tradition of the primitive Church is the ground on which the fathers themselves received the books of the new Testament as Apostolical; and, on the same ground, we receive them. We gladly add to this every weight which can be derived from internal evidence, or from the authority of early councils: for we know that no argument should be neglected which may fairly confirm our faith. But the first ground on which we receive the new Testament is, that it can be proved to have come from the pens or the dictation of the Apostles of

¹ There is a passage much to the purpose, quoted by Jones (*On the Canon*, Part I. ch. vi.) from the Preface to Baxter's *Saints' Rest*. 'For my part, I confess, I could never boast of any such testimony or light of the Spirit nor reason neither, which, without human testimony, would have made me believe that the book of Canticles is canonical and written by Solomon, and the book of Wisdom Apocryphal and written by Philo, &c. Nor could I have known all or any historical books, such as Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, &c. to be written by divine inspiration, but by tradition, &c.'

Christ, and that to those Apostles Christ promised infallibility in matters of faith.

1 The promise of inspiration and infallibility appears in such passages as the following :

‘ The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My Name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.’ John xiv. 25, 26.

‘ When He, the Spirit of truth is come, He will guide you into all truth, and He will shew you things to come.’ John xvi. 13.

So ‘ it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost.’ Mark xiii. 11.

And what Christ promised, his Apostles claimed. They speak of having the deep things of God revealed to them by His Spirit, 1 Cor. ii. 10. They declare their own Gospel to be the truth, and anathematize all who preach any other Gospel, Gal. i. 8. They speak of ‘ the mystery of Christ, which in other ages was not made known to the sons of men,’ as being now revealed to the ‘ Apostles and prophets by the Spirit,’ Ephes. iii. 4, 5; and treat the Gospel as a faith ‘ once for all delivered to the saints,’ Jude 3.

If therefore we believe the new Testament at all, we believe that Jesus Christ gave a promise of inspiration to the Apostles ; and that the Apostles claimed the promise, professed to have received the inspiration, and accordingly assumed to be the only infallible depositories of the doctrines of the Gospel.

2 We have therefore, in the next place, simply to determine the genuineness of the writings which profess to be Apostolical, and our labour will be finished. If we know that any book was written by an Apostle, we know that, as regards doctrine and faith, it is inspired and infallible, and therefore we receive it into the Canon of Scripture. The primitive Church acted on this principle ; and we act upon the same.

More or less, all ancient writings must be subjected to a test like this. If we wish to know whether certain books were written by Cicero, or Cæsar, or Tacitus, we examine the evidence, and decide according to it. The simple fact, that they have ever been received as theirs, is a strong presumption that they proceeded from them. But still we mostly require farther proof.

Now, as regards the new Testament, it is infinitely more important to be assured that a book was written by St. John or St. Paul, than to know that one was written by Cæsar or Cicero. And accordingly God, in His Providence, has afforded us far more abundant evidence concerning the genuineness of the different books of the new Testament, than can be found concerning any other writings of antiquity. That evidence is principally dependent on *testimony*, but is not resolvable into mere *authority*. It is the *witness* of the Church, not merely its *sanction*, to which we appeal.

Now the position of the Church in its earliest ages was such that its witness on this subject is singularly unexceptionable. During the very lifetimes of the Apostles, it had spread through the civilized world. Europe, Asia, Africa, had all heard the voice of the Apostles, and all had flourishing Churches long before the death of the last of that sacred body. The books which the Apostles had written were therefore to be found, not in one or two obscure corners of the world, but they were treasured up, and read and revered in Rome, and Alexandria, in Antioch and Ephesus, in Corinth and Thessalonica, very probably in Spain and Gaul and Arabia, perhaps even in the remote region of Britain itself. There were therefore witnesses in every corner of the globe. Even where the arms of Rome had not carried conquest, the feet of Apostles had carried good tidings of peace. In many of these Churches, the writers of the sacred books were well known and constant visitors; so that Epistles, as from them, or Gospels with their

names, could not have been palmed off upon their converts, who could continually have rectified errors of this kind by direct appeal to the living sources of Divine instruction. The writers of the new Testament themselves took care that what they wrote should be widely circulated, and extensively known, when first they wrote it. St. Paul bids the Colossians send his epistle to them, to be read as well in the Church of Laodicea (Col. iv. 16). He charges the Thessalonians, that they should suffer his epistle to be 'read to all the holy brethren' (1 Thess. v. 27). We are informed concerning the Gospels, that they were written, the first by an Apostle, for the use of the Church of Judea¹; the second, by St. Mark under the dictation of St. Peter², for the use of those Christians, amongst whom St. Peter had been preaching, and who wished to have the substance of it preserved in writing³: that St. Luke, the companion of St. Paul, wrote his Gospel at St. Paul's dictation⁴; and that St. John wrote his in his last days at Ephesus, having first seen and approved the other Gospels, writing his own as supplementary to them⁵.

These and similar considerations shew that the writings of the new Testament must have had a great degree of publicity, and therefore great protection against forgery and fraud, from their earliest publication. Every separate Church, and every separate city, to which they spread, was a guard against corruption, and a check upon its neighbours. But at the same time, wide as the empire of Christ had spread, it was not, then as now, a collection of disunited communities, but one living, intercommunicating whole. The early records with one voice proclaim that all Christendom was as one man. There was a circulation of life-blood through the whole. A

¹ Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 24; Iren. iii. 1.

² Iren. iii. 1; iii. 11.

³ Euseb. i. 15; vi. 14, on the authority of Clemens Alexandrinus.

⁴ Iren. iii. 1.

⁵ Euseb. iii. 24; Hieron. *De Viris Illustribus*, s. v. Joannes.

Christian could not go from Rome to Alexandria, or from Alexandria to Ephesus, but he bore a talisman with him, which made him welcomed as a brother. And the degree of intercourse, which took place in the very earliest times between far distant Churches, is apparent by the letter of Clement of Rome to the Church of Corinth, by the solicitude of Ignatius for the different cities to which he wrote on the eve of his martyrdom, by the journey of Polycarp from Smyrna to Rome to discuss the Paschal controversy, by the appointment of Irenæus, a native of Asia, to the chief bishopric in Gaul, and by numerous similar facts.

We have therefore the following securities that the Churches from the first would preserve the writings of the Apostles safe and in their integrity.

(1) The presence of the Apostles with them, and frequent intercourse among them, whilst the sacred books were in writing.

(2) The publicity given to these books from the first.

(3) The wide diffusion of the Church throughout the world, so that copies would be multiplied everywhere, and one part of the Church would be a check against forgeries in another.

(4) The intimate communion of every part of Christendom with the rest, so that every facility was afforded to every portion of the Church, of knowing what were the Apostles' writings, and of guarding against mistake.

(5) To these we may add, that there were divisions in many Churches even from the Apostles' days (see 1 Cor. iii. 3, 4; Gal. ii. 4, &c.), which necessarily created independent witnesses, even in individual Churches, each party being a check on the other.

(6) And lastly, that in God's Providence the Apostle St. John lived at the great city of Ephesus, for thirty years after

the works of the other Apostles had been written ; and was thus living in the midst of the civilized world, as a final and authoritative court of appeal, if there could be any doubt as to which were Apostolical, and which Apocryphal writings.

Can we doubt then, that the primitive Church was a body so remarkably constituted, that its testimony united, on this particular subject, the singularly opposite merits of unanimity and yet of mutual independence, and at the same time enjoyed the most extraordinary powers for knowing the truth, with no interest in corrupting it, and without the power to corrupt it, even if it had the will ?

We conclude therefore, that the Scriptures, which the primitive Church held as Apostolical, must have been so. And we may add that, owing to the wide diffusion of the Church throughout the world, it would have been impossible for a forger in after times to pass off his forgery on the Church ; for if it was received in one place, it would speedily be rejected in another, and convicted of falsehood, on the sure ground of novelty. The primitive Church, therefore, was singularly fitted by Providence to be a witness and keeper of Holy Writ ; even a witness and a keeper of it against future as well as present corruptions.

It is impossible to give more than a very brief sketch of the evidence which we derive from the early Church, thus qualified to bear testimony. We may classify it in the following order :—

- (1) Manuscripts of the original.
- (2) Versions in numerous languages.
- (3) Catalogues.
- (4) Quotations and references, and commentaries.

(1) We have manuscripts of the new Testament Scriptures in very great numbers, preserved to us in different quarters of the globe. The testimony which these MSS. bear, all tend to the same point ; viz. the general integrity of the text

of the new Testament, as we have it now. These MSS. indeed are so far different from each other, as to be independent witnesses; for though they agree in preserving the same general text, they differ in verbal minutiae, and have various readings, like MSS. of all ancient authors; and it is found that these MSS. can be classed into different families; so that each family bears a line of testimony distinct from the others. Thus Griesbach distinguished the Greek MSS. into three distinct texts: the Alexandrine, which he found to correspond with the reading of the famous Codex Alexandrinus and with the quotations of Origen, the great Alexandrian critic; the Byzantine, including those MSS. which in their peculiarities agree with the MSS. which have been brought to us direct from Constantinople; the Western, to which belong the MSS. which have been chiefly found in Europe, and which in their peculiarities resemble the Latin version. Other critics (as Matthäi, Scholz, &c.) have made different arrangements and classifications; but all agree in the observation, that we have distinct streams of MSS. coming down to us from the most remote antiquity, and preserving in the main the same text of the new Testament, though differing in minute particulars, sufficient to constitute them in some degree independent witnesses, and existing in the different quarters of the globe. It is true, the most ancient of these MSS. is probably not older than the fourth century: but it is well known to all scholars how very ancient a MS. of the fourth century is considered; and how very few MSS. in the world have anything approaching to such antiquity; and it must be borne in mind that a MS. of the fourth century represents a text of much earlier date, from which it must have been copied; and when we have many independent MSS., and some of them of nearly the same great antiquity, we know that they respectively and independently bear witness to the existence of an older text or texts, to which they owe their original.

Now here is one evidence of the genuineness of our new Testament writings. They are preserved to us in innumerable MSS. in all parts of the world ; MSS. whose authority is of the highest possible character. The books which are thus preserved are not the Apocryphal, but the generally received Canonical books of the new Testament.

(2) We have a great number of ancient Versions of the new Testament Scriptures in the various languages which were vernacular in the early ages of the Church. Thus we have Versions in Latin, Syriac, Coptic, Sahidic, Arabic, Ethiopic, Armenian, and other languages. The Versions, which are supposed to have the greatest claim to antiquity, are the Latin and the Syriac. That there was a very ancient Latin Version there can be no manner of doubt : for the speedy diffusion of the Gospel in Europe and Africa made it a matter of great consequence that the new Testament Scriptures should speedily be translated into the Latin tongue. The ancient Italic may, therefore, very probably have been made in the days of the Apostles. The only difficulty attending it is the many alterations which the Latin Versions subsequently underwent, which make it hard to ascertain what MS. fairly represents the most ancient text. Yet all the Latin Versions of any authority, at present in existence, give their testimony, in the main, to the integrity of the text of the new Testament as we have it now. The Peschito Syriac is by most scholars considered to be the oldest of all the Versions ; and it has the advantage of being a Version from the Greek into the vernacular tongue of our Lord and His Apostles. It is by many thought to be a work of the first century, and may have been seen by the Apostle St. John. The Syrians themselves held the tradition that it was made by St. Mark. The testimony, which it bears concerning the Canon of the new Testament, is most satisfactory, so far as it goes. It contains, in literal translation, the four

Gospels, the Acts, thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of St. James, the first Epistle of St. Peter, and the first of St. John,—that is to say, all our present Canon except the Apocalypse, the Epistle of St. Jude, the second of St. Peter, and the second and third of St. John. There are many reasons why so ancient a Version should not have contained these last named books. If it were made so early as has been supposed, some of the excluded books may not have been written. At all events, it is highly probable that they were not all at once collected into one volume, and some shorter and later pieces are especially likely to have been at first omitted¹.

(3) We have among very early fathers regular catalogues of the books of the new Testament, as received and read in the Church.

Origen, the most learned of the Greek fathers, who was born A.D. 185, *i. e.* less than 90 years from the death of St. John, gives a catalogue exactly corresponding with our present Canon².

Eusebius, another most learned and accurate inquirer, born at Cæsarea in Palestine, A.D. 270, gives a catalogue exactly corresponding with our own, except that he speaks of the Epistles of St. James, St. Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, as generally received, yet doubted of by some; and says of the Apocalypse,

¹ On the importance of the Syriac version, see Jones, *On the Canon*, Pt. I. ch. XIV—XIX.

² Comment. in Matt. ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25. In this Catalogue he omits St. James and St. Jude. But in his thirteenth Homily on Genesis, he speaks of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, Peter, James and Jude, as the authors of the books of the new Testament. In his seventh Homily on the book of Joshua, if we may trust the Latin translation of Ruffinus, in which alone it exists, he enumerates all the books which we now have. See Jones, *On the Canon*, Pt. I. ch. viii.; Bp. Marsh's *Lectures*, Pt. v. *On Authority of the New Testament*, Lect. xxiv.; Lardner, Vol. II. ch. XXXVIII.

that though some doubt, yet others received it; and he himself received it, and he himself considered it as canonical¹.

Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 326, and who therefore must have been born in the third century, gives a catalogue exactly corresponding with ours².

Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, A.D. 349, gives the same list, with the exception of the Apocalypse³.

The Council of Laodicea, A.D. 364, gives the same list as St. Cyril⁴.

Epiphanius, A.D. 370, gives the same list as ours⁵.

Gregory Nazianzen, A.D. 375, who was born about the time of the Council of Nice, gives the same list as ours, omitting the Apocalypse⁶.

Jerom, who was born A.D. 329, was educated at Rome, and was ordained presbyter at Antioch, A.D. 378, gives the same list as ours; except that he observes that most persons in the Latin Church did not consider the Epistle to the Hebrews as St. Paul's, though he himself held that it was so⁷.

Ruffinus, presbyter of Aquileia, contemporary and friend of Jerom, gives the same catalogue as we now possess⁸.

Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, A.D. 394, (born A.D. 355), gives the same catalogue as ours⁹.

¹ *H. E.* III. 25.

² *Ex Festali. Epist.* XXXIX. Tom. II. p. 961; Edit. Benedict. Tom. II. p. 38, Colon. 1686.

³ *Cateches.* IV. § 36. He makes mention of certain forged Gospels, *ψευδεπίγραφα*, and ascribes to the Manicheans a Gospel according to St. Thomas.

⁴ Concil. Laodicen. Can. IX.

⁵ *Hæres.* 76, c. 5.

⁶ Gregor. Nazianz. *Carm.* XXXIII.

⁷ *Epist.* L. *ad Paulinum. Opp.* Tom. IV. p. 574; Ed. Bened. Tom. III. p. 9, Paris, 1602. On the Epistle to the Hebrews, see *De Viris Illustribus*, s. v. Paulus.

⁸ *Exposit. in Symb. Apostol.* § 36. ad calc. oper. Cyprian.

⁹ *De Doctrina Christiana.* Lib. II. c. 8. Tom. III. p. 23.

The Council of Carthage (A.D. 397 ?) gives the same catalogue¹.

(4) But besides these formal catalogues, we have from the very first ages a series of quotations, references, and allusions to our sacred books, and in some cases regular harmonies and commentaries upon them.

This is a wide subject. It occupies the first five volumes in the octavo edition of Lardner's most valuable work on *The Credibility of the Gospel History*. An account of it here must necessarily be brief.

The writings of the Apostolical fathers are few in number, and there are many reasons why they should not quote so frequently and fully from the books of the new Testament as those who succeeded them. Yet there are, nevertheless, a considerable number of references and quotations from the books which we possess as the new Testament Scriptures even in them.

Clement, who probably died before St. John, especially ascribes the first Epistle to the Corinthians to St. Paul. Words of our blessed Lord, found in the Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, are recommended with a high degree of respect, but without the names of the Evangelists: and there is reason to think that he alludes to the Acts, the Epistle to the Romans, the two Epistles to the Corinthians, and divers other of the Epistles of the new Testament².

Ignatius, who suffered martyrdom very soon after the death of St. John, in writing to the Ephesians, ascribes the Epistle to that Church to St. Paul, and cites several passages from it. He alludes to St. Matthew's, St. Luke's, and probably to St. John's Gospel; also, probably, to the Acts, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Timothy,

¹ Concil. Carthag. III. Can. XLVII.

² Lardner, Vol. II. ch. 2.

1 Peter, 1 and 3 John. He appears also to have expressions denoting collections of the Gospels and Epistles of the Apostles¹.

Polycarp, a disciple of St. John, Bishop of Smyrna, quotes Philippians, and speaks of St. Paul as having written to that Church. He quotes also expressions from St. Matthew and St. Luke, 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians; and there are manifest references to Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, 1 and 2 Timothy, 1 Peter, 1 John, and probably to the Hebrews².

If Barnabas and Hermas are to be reckoned Apostolical, although there are manifest references to the new Testament in their works, yet the nature of their writings makes it most improbable that they should have quoted much from it, and accounts for their comparative silence³.

Papias, who was well acquainted with Polycarp, and, as some think, even with St. John, and was an anxious enquirer about all that had come from the Apostles and followers of Christ, bears testimony to the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, quotes the first Epistle of St. Peter and the first of St. John, appears to have a reference to the book of Acts, and there is every reason to suppose he received the Apocalypse. There are no works of his remaining, except a fragment preserved by Eusebius⁴.

Justin Martyr, the first of the fathers of whom we have any considerable remains, was converted to Christianity about A.D. 133, flourished chiefly about A.D. 140, *i. e.* 40 years after the death of St. John, and died a martyr about A.D. 164 or 167. He has many quotations from the four Gospels, which he refers to under the name of the *Memoirs of the Apos-*

¹ Lardner, Vol. II. ch. v.

² Ibid. Vol. II. ch. vi.

³ Ibid. Vol. II. ch. i. iv.

⁴ Euseb. *H. E.* Lib. III. cap. 39; Lardner, Vol. II. ch. ix.

*iles*¹. He has, moreover, referred to the Acts, many of the Epistles, and expressly assigns the Book of Revelation to St. John. In his first Apology, he tells us that the memoirs of the Apostles, and the writings of the Prophets, were read in the assemblies for public worship, and discourses made upon them by the presiding presbyter².

Tatian, the disciple of Justin Martyr, composed a harmony of the Gospels called *Diatessaron*³.

The circular Epistle of the Churches of Venice and Lyons, concerning the sufferings of their martyrs in the reign of Marcus Antoninus, uses language from the Gospels of St. Luke and St. John, Acts, Romans, Philippians, 1 Peter, 1 John, and the Revelation⁴.

Irenæus, who was a hearer of Polycarp the disciple of St. John⁵, and became Bishop of Lyons, A.D. 177, assures us that there were four Gospels and no more⁶, all of which he has largely quoted, with the names of their writers, and has given an account of their composition⁷. He refers the Acts to

¹ Ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων, which he explains by ἡ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια.—Apol. i. p. 98, B.

Bishop Marsh in his *Dissertation On the Origin of the Four Gospels*, ch. xv., supposes that Justin does not allude to our present Gospels, but to a certain original document, which the Bishop supposes to have existed, which was early composed by the Apostles, and from which the Evangelists compiled their several Gospels. The words ἡ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια he considers an interpolation. He argues that *Memoirs of the Apostles* more probably mean a single work than a collection of works, and that Justin's quotations are not exact from our present Gospels. His arguments are considered by Bishop Kaye, *Writings of Justin Martyr*, ch. viii. The last named prelate seems to have clearly proved that there is no reason for doubting that our present Gospels are those cited by Justin, though, at times, he rather quotes the purport than the very words of a passage.

² Apol. i. p. 98; Lardner, Vol. ii. ch. x.

³ Lardner, Vol. ii. ch. xiii.

⁵ Hieronym. *De V. I.* s. v. Irenæus.

⁶ *Adv. Hæres.* iii. 11.

⁴ Ibid. ch. xvi.

⁷ Ibid. iii. 1.

St. Luke. He quotes all St. Paul's Epistles, except Philemon and the Hebrews, also 1 Peter, 1 and 2 John, and the Apocalypse, which he expressly assigns to St. John the Apostle¹, and *probably* the Epistle of St. James. 'His quotations from the Gospels are so numerous, that they occupy more than twelve folio columns in the index of Scripture passages annexed to the Benedictine edition².'

Theophilus of Antioch (circa. A. D. 170) quotes St. Matthew, St. Luke, several of St. Paul's Epistles, and we are assured by Eusebius that, in his work against Hermogenes, he quoted the Apocalypse³.

Clement of Alexandria, who lived at the end of the second century, about 100 years after the completion of the Canon of Scripture, quotes all the four Gospels, and especially tells us the origin of St. Mark's⁴. He ascribes the Acts to St. Luke; quotes all St. Paul's Epistles, except the short Epistle to Philemon, and ascribes the Epistle to the Hebrews to St. Paul, though he thinks it was written in Hebrew by St. Paul, and translated into Greek by St. Luke⁵. He quotes three of the Catholic Epistles, viz. 1 John, 1 Peter, Jude; for it is doubtful whether he refers expressly to St. James, or the second Epistle of St. Peter, and the second and third of St. John. The Apocalypse he expressly ascribes to St. John⁶.

Tertullian, presbyter of Carthage, of the same date with Clement, quotes all the books of the new Testament, except perhaps St. James' Epistle, the second of St. Peter, and the third of St. John. The Epistle to the Hebrews he assigns to

¹ *Adv. Hæres.* iv. 20; v. 26. The time of seeing the Apocalypse is mentioned v. 30; viz. towards the end of the reign of Domitian, if the word *ἑώρακέν* is used of the seeing of the Apocalypse, not, as some think, of the duration of St. John's own life.

² Bp. Marsh's *Lectures*, Pt. v. Lect. xxiv.; Lardner, Vol. II. ch. xvii.

³ Lardner, Vol. II. ch. xx.

⁴ Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14.

⁵ Lardner, Vol. II. ch. xxii.; Bp. Kaye's *Clement of Alex.* ch. viii.

Barnabas¹. Dr. Lardner has observed, that ‘There are perhaps more and larger quotations of the new Testament from this one Christian author than of all the works of Cicero, though of so uncommon excellence for thought and style, in the writers of all characters for several ages².’

We are now arrived at Origen, who, as we have seen, gives a complete catalogue of the new Testament as we have it now³.

Dionysius of Alexandria, A.D. 247, quotes the Gospels, Acts, St. Paul's Epistles, especially ascribing the Hebrews to St. Paul, the three Epistles of St. John. On the Apocalypse he has a long dissertation, from which it appears that it was very generally received by Christians as written by St. John, though he himself inclines to attribute it to another John, whom he considered a holy and divinely inspired man⁴.

Cyprian, A.D. 250, quotes all the new Testament, except the Epistles to Philemon and the Hebrews, the third of St. John, the second of St. Peter, and St. James. The Apocalypse he often quotes as St. John's⁵.

Methodius, Bishop of Olympus in Lycia, circ. A.D. 260, constantly quotes or refers to the Gospels and Acts, most of St. Paul's Epistles, especially the Hebrews, also 1 Peter, 1 John, and the Apocalypse⁶.

Eusebius has already been adduced as a witness, having given a catalogue of the new Testament Scriptures, as we have them now.

It is unnecessary to continue the list farther. We have already seen that from this time we may find in the works of the fathers full catalogues of the books of the new Testament,

¹ *De Pudicitia*, c. 20.

² Lardner, Vol. II. ch. xxviii. See also Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, ch. v. p. 307.

³ Lardner, ch. xxxviii.

⁴ Ibid. Vol. III. ch. xliii.

⁵ Ibid. Vol. III. ch. xlii.

⁶ Ibid. Vol. III. ch. lvii.

and the number of quotations from them in their writings grows fuller and more abundant.

We must not, however, suppose that all who used and admitted the same Scriptures with the exception of those outrageous heretics, such as the Gnostics and the Manichæans, who were rather heathen philosophers with a tinge of Christianity, than Christians with a tincture of philosophy. Thus the Marcionites, the Donatists, Arius¹, Photinus², Lucifer³, and other schismatics and heretics of the first four centuries, received the same sacred books with the Catholic Christians.

Not only heretics, moreover, but heathens and persecutors knew the sacred books and sought to destroy them. Thus in the persecution of Diocletian, there was an edict in 303, that the Christian churches should be destroyed, and their Scriptures burned. Accordingly great search was made for the books of the new Testament, and those Christians, who, to save themselves, gave up their books to the persecutors, acquired the opprobrious name of Traditores⁴.

When Constantine the Great embraced Christianity, finding that the persecution under Diocletian had diminished the number of copies of the new Testament, he authorised Eusebius bishop of Caesarea, to get fifty copies of the new Testament written out for him, desiring that they should be skilfully and carefully written on fine parchment⁵.

We have seen then that numerous MSS., the most ancient Versions, the catalogues given us by the fathers, quotations and references from the time of the earliest Apostolical father gradually increasing in number, yet numerous from the beginning, the consent of heretics, the enmity of persecutors, all witness to the existence, from the earliest times, of the new Testament Scrip-

¹ Lardner, ch. LIV.

² Ibid. ch. LIX.

³ Ibid. ch. LXXXIX.

⁴ Ibid. ch. ICI.

⁵ Ibid. ch. LVI.

⁶ Euseb. Lib. iv. c. 36; Lardner, ch. LIX.

tures, and all this testimony is uniform in favour of the very books which we now possess.

It may be added, that although it is quite clear that there were certain early writers, such as Clement, Barnabas, and Hermas, highly esteemed and whose writings were read in some Churches; and though there were some Apocryphal books professing to be the works of the Apostles and Evangelists, yet there is good reason to assert that these books are not quoted by the fathers as authority, and were not received by the Church as Canonical Scripture¹.

To the external evidence, the internal proofs of genuineness might be added, if time and space would allow. Books which are forgeries, generally shew, when carefully scrutinized, plain proofs that they are not his, whose name they bear. The language, the ideas, the statements of facts, some little circumstance of date or place, some circumstance connected with the character, knowledge, or condition of the author, are found inconsistent and incapable of being explained. Or if this is not the case, there is a markedly studied effort to avoid all this, and to make the forgery appear a genuine work. But the different books of the new Testament, though written by eight different hands, under vastly different conditions, have yet defied the efforts of critics, to disprove their genuineness. They only come out the brighter from every fiery trial. Their style and language is just what we should expect from the writers to whom they are ascribed. They abound in minute particulars, most naturally and simply introduced, which correspond accurately with the state of things existing at the time, and in the place in which the authors wrote. Coincidences have been pointed out, which the cleverest forger could never have designed, and which only patient searching could have detected:

¹ See Jones, *On the Canon*, Part II. ch. 1, Observ. III.; Lardner, ch. x. XIV. XVII. XXII. XXXVIII. LVII., &c.

whereas, if such coincidences had been designed, they would have been put prominently forward to meet the view¹. In this, and in similar manners, we may confirm by internal examination, the results deduced from external testimony.

But before we conclude this sketch, we must observe, that in the accounts of the catalogues and quotations given by the different early fathers, we could not but remark that some books were less universally quoted, and classed in the catalogues than others. We learn, as early as Origen, and, more clearly afterwards, from Eusebius, that though the Church generally received the Canon of the new Testament, as we receive it now, yet some few books were by some persons considered as doubtful.

Eusebius makes three distinct classes of books², viz. :

ὁμολογούμενοι, those universally received ;

ἀντιλεγόμενοι, those generally received, but doubted of by some ;

νόθοι, i. e. Apocryphal books, rejected by all but heretics.

In like manner, Cyril of Jerusalem distinguishes between those, παρὰ πᾶσιν ὁμολογούμενα, owned by all, and ἀμφιβαλλόμενα, doubted of by some³.

Now the undoubted books, according to Eusebius, which all received, were the four Gospels, the Acts, thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, one of St. Peter, one of St. John. He adds that Christians generally received the Hebrews, James, 2 Pet., 2 and 3 John, Jude, Revelation. These he esteemed canonical, but tells us that some doubted concerning their genuineness. He also mentions the Epistles of Clement and Barnabas, and the Pastor of Hermas, as esteemed useful by many, but not to be considered a part of Canonical Scripture⁴. Now the principal

¹ See Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ*, passim ; Marsh's *Lect.* Pt. v. Lect. xxvi.

² *H. E.* iii. 3, 25.

³ Cyril. *Cateches.* iv. 36.

⁴ Euseb. *H. E.* as above ; Lardner, lxxii.

reasons for doubting the genuineness and Canonicity of the books which Eusebius speaks of as ἀντιλεγόμενα, were of this nature. The Hebrews has not St. Paul's name, and is thought to be different in style from his other writings¹. St. James might not have been an Apostle, and therefore his Epistle might have no claim to be in the Canon. The Apocalypse introduces the name of St. John contrary to that Apostle's custom elsewhere; and some supposed it was written by John the elder, a person whom Papias mentions, and not by St. John the Apostle².

To take first the Epistle of St. James; there is strong reason to believe that whether the writer was James the son of Zebedee, or James the Lord's brother, he was in any case an Apostle; for James the Lord's brother is in Scripture called an Apostle³, and was in all probability the same as James the son of Alphæus, or Cleopas, (the two names being very probably the same) his mother being Mary the sister of the Virgin Mary⁴. So that there is no reason to exclude his Epistle from the Canon, because he was not an Apostle. But farther, his Epistle is in the Syriac version, and the authority of the Syrian Church is very important on this head; for the Church of Syria bordered on Palestine, where St. James, the Lord's brother, was bishop, and spoke the same language as the natives of Palestine itself. We must remember too, that Eusebius tells us that this Epistle was received by the great majority of Christians; and that it is by no means wonderful, that an Epistle, written by the Bishop of Jerusalem to the Jews, should not have become known to the Grecian Churches so soon as others; and hence more doubt might arise about it than about other Epistles⁵.

Of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Apocalypse, we learn

¹ Hieronym. *de V. I. in Paul.* Opp. Tom. i.

² Euseb. *H. E.* III. 39.

³ Gal. i. 19.

⁴ See Lardner, Vol. vi. ch. xvi.

⁵ See Marsh's *Lect.* Pt. v. Lect. xxv.

that the former was not fully admitted by the Latin, nor the latter by the Greek Church among Canonical Scriptures¹.

Of the Epistle to the Hebrews, we may observe that the absence of the Apostle's name may be fully accounted for by the fact, that he was the Apostle of the Gentiles, not of the circumcision; and therefore when he writes to the Jews, he does not put his name, and claim his Apostleship, as not wishing to put forward the same claim to authority over the Jews which he asserts over the Gentile Churches². But the Epistle is probably referred to by Clement of Rome³; and perhaps by Polycarp⁴. We have in its favour the testimony of Origen, Clement of Alexandria, Dionysius of Jerusalem, the Council of Laodicea, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerom⁵. It is in the Syriac Canon. And as regards the supposed difference of style from the general writings of St. Paul, the opinion of Clement of Alexandria, that St. Paul wrote the Epistle in Hebrew or Syriac, and that it was translated by St. Luke into Greek, would explain all the difficulty⁶. Yet Mr. Forster appears to have proved, by most careful and accurate comparison, that the style of the Epistle to the Hebrews, notwithstanding the apparent dissimilarity, has all the peculiarity of the writings of St. Paul, a peculiarity so great that the genuineness of the Epistle can hardly be questioned⁷.

The Apocalypse, which is the only other book of any considerable length, which is doubted, is ascribed by Papias to John, probably the Apostle. It is the only book which Justin

¹ Hieronym. *Dardan.* Epist. cxxix. Tom. III. p. 105; *De V. I. s. v.* Paul. Tom. I. p. 350, Paris, 1602.

² Clem. Alex. ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14; Hieron. in *Galat.* cap. I.

³ Eusebius observes that Clement uses the very language of the Epistle.—*H. E.* III. 38.

⁴ Lardner, ch. vi.

⁵ See the lists above given.

⁶ Ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14.

⁷ Forster, *On the Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews.*

Martyr mentions by name, and he expressly assigns it to St. John. Irenæus constantly quotes it and refers it to St. John. Tertullian and Theophilus of Antioch quote it. Clement of Alexandria assigns it to St. John. So do Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria, Cyprian, Eusebius, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Jerom, the Council of Carthage¹. All these are witnesses of great importance, and a large number of them living within a century of the date when the book in question was composed. Especially Papias, Justin Martyr, and Irenæus, the very earliest fathers after those called Apostolical, speak much concerning it, and quote frequently from it. Melito, a contemporary of Justin Martyr and Irenæus, is also, according to Eusebius, a witness to the Apocalypse of St. John².

We may now close our brief view of the evidence concerning the Canon of the new Testament, and whilst we rejoice that councils in the fourth century, weighing the evidence, decided on the Canon, and settled it as we have it now, we cannot admit that the present Church receives the Scriptures, whether of the old Testament or the new, merely on the authority of the Church of the fourth century; inasmuch as the Church of the fourth century itself received them on the testimony of earlier ages, and the present Church receives it on the same. That testimony, even if Councils had been silent, would be of itself amply sufficient to prove that the new Testament Scriptures, which we now possess, are the genuine works of the Apostles and Evangelists.

¹ See the lists and authorities referred to above.

² Καὶ λόγος αὐτοῦ (Μελίτωνος) περὶ προφητείας, καὶ ὁ περὶ φιλονεξίας· καὶ ἡ κλείς· καὶ τὰ περὶ τοῦ διαβόλου καὶ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου.—Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 26.

SECTION III.

ON THE REAL VALUE OF TRADITION, AND
THE READING OF THE APOCRYPHA.

I. **T**HE Church of England then holds, in conformity with the Church of old, that Scripture is absolutely perfect in relation to the end to which it tends, viz. the teaching us all things necessary to salvation. She denies the existence, and rejects the authority of any parallel and equal tradition, of any doctrines, necessary to salvation, handed down from generation to generation. But it is not true, that the Church of England rejects the proper use of tradition, though she will not suffer it to be unduly exalted. She does not neglect the testimony of antiquity, and cut herself off from the Communion of the Saints of old.

It has been already remarked that, besides the tradition which the Church of Rome holds necessary to be received, which is a tradition equal and parallel with the Scriptures, there are also traditions, which are subservient to Scripture, and calculated to throw light upon it. Such tradition, when kept in its right place, the Church of England has ever used and respected.

Now this tradition is of two kinds, Hermeneutical Tradition, and Ecclesiastical Tradition. The former tends to explain and interpret the Scripture; the latter relates to discipline and ceremonial. With regard to the latter we find, that the new Testament has nowhere given express rules for rites, ordinances, and discipline; although we evidently discover that rites, ordinances and discipline did exist, even when the new Testament was written. For our guidance therefore in these matters, which are useful for edification, but not essential for salvation, we gladly follow the example of the Churches nearest to the Apostles' times, which we conceive to have been ordered by the

Apostles themselves, and to be the best witnesses of Apostolic order and Apostolic usages.

With regard to Hermeneutical Tradition, we view matters thus. Those early Christians, who had the personal instruction of the Apostles and their immediate companions, are more likely to have known the truth of Christian doctrine, than those of after ages, when heresies had become prevalent, when men had learned to wrest Scripture to destruction, and sects and parties had warped and biassed men's minds, so that they could not see clearly the true sense of Holy Writ. Truth is one, but error is multiform: and we know that, in process of time, new doctrines constantly sprang up in the Church, and by degrees gained footing and took root. We believe therefore that, if we can learn what was the constant teaching of the primitive Christians, we shall be most likely to find the true sense of Scripture preserved in that teaching: and wherever we can trace the first rise of a doctrine, and so stamp it with novelty, the proof of its novelty will be the proof of its falsehood; for what could find no place among the earliest Churches of Christ can scarcely have come from the Apostles of Christ, or from a right interpretation of the Scriptures, which they wrote. We do not, in thus judging, appeal to the authority of any individual father, not even if he be one of those who had seen the Apostles, and had received the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost. We know that they were fallible men, though we believe them to have been pious and wise men. But we look to their writings for evidence, as to what were the doctrines prevalent in the Church during the earliest ages, and we believe that, if we can discover what the doctrines of those earliest ages were, we have a most important clue to guide us in our course through the Scriptures themselves: because we judge that the Church thus early must almost certainly have, in the main, preserved the integrity of the faith, and could not, whilst the voice of Apostolic men was in their ears, have fallen away into error and heresy. We

know that, in those days, men had many advantages over ourselves for the interpreting of the new Testament. A knowledge of the language, the customs, the history of events, which illustrate the Scriptures, was of itself most important. Some of them must have had in their memories the personal teaching of the Apostles, for they were their immediate hearers and followers. Many of them lived within a comparatively short time from their departure. They took the utmost pains to preserve the purity of the Apostolic faith in the Church. The Church of their days had still the *charismata*, or miraculous gifts of the Spirit, visibly poured out upon it; and we may say that in every, or almost every manner it was qualified, beyond any subsequent Church or age, to understand the Scriptures, and to exhibit the purity and integrity of the Christian faith.

The least then, that can be said, is that the doctrine of the ancient Church is an useful check on any new interpretation of Scripture. Antiquity is a mark of truth, and novelty a mark of error in religion; and this rule has ever been found valuable in important controversies. The Socinians have striven to shew that Justin Martyr invented the doctrine of the Trinity, deriving it from the writings of Plato. Catholic Christians, on the contrary, have proved that from the earliest times we have clear evidence that that doctrine was held in the Church, and that therefore it is traceable to the Apostles, and not to Plato, that it springs from a true, not from an erroneous interpretation of Scripture. A like form has the controversy with the Church of Rome assumed. Many of her peculiar doctrines have been proved to owe their origin to comparatively recent times; and so they have been shewn to be unfit to stand the well-known test of Tertullian, that, "what is first is true, what is later is adulterate¹."

¹ *Hæc enim ratio valet adversus omnes hæreses, id esse verum, quodcunque primum, id esse adulterum, quodcunque posterius.—Tertull. adv. Prax. 2.*

Thus then tradition may be useful in the interpretation of Scripture, though not as adding to its authority. We well know that Scripture is perfect in itself, for the end for which it was designed. But we know also that no aid for its interpretation should be neglected.

As regards order and ceremony, tradition is again valuable. Scripture is, at least, not full on these matters. Yet they are essential for the regulating and governing of a Church: we appeal therefore to the purest and earliest models of antiquity. We cannot err in doing this; for, in asserting the sufficiency of Scripture, we assert it for the end to which it was designed. As we do not assert it as fit to teach us arts and sciences, so neither do we assert it as designed entirely to regulate Church discipline and ceremony. And where it does not profess to be a perfect guide, we derogate not from its authority in seeking other help. On matters of faith it is complete and full; but not in all things besides.

That the Church of England takes this view of the right use of tradition, and of the value of the testimony of the primitive Church, will appear from the following documents.

The Convocation of 1571, which passed the XXXIX Articles in the form in which we have them now, which is the only authoritative form, passed also a code of Canons, in one of which is the following clause: ‘In the first place let preachers take heed that they deliver nothing from the pulpit, to be religiously held and believed by the people, but that which is agreeable to the old and new Testament, and such as the *Catholic fathers and ancient bishops have collected therefrom*¹.’

In like manner, in the Preface to the Ordination Service we

¹ Imprimis vero videbunt, ne quid unquam doceant pro concione, quod a populo religiose teneri et credi velint, nisi quod consentaneum sit doctrinæ Veteris aut Novi Testamenti, quodque ex illa ipsa doctrina Catholici patres, et veteres episcopi collegerint.—Cardwell’s *Synodalia*, Vol. i. p. 126.

read, 'It is evident to all men reading Holy Scripture, *and ancient authors*, that from the Apostles' time there have been three orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.'

So Archbishop Cranmer, the great reformer of our Liturgy and compiler of our Articles, writes, 'I also grant that every *exposition* of the Scripture, whereinsoever the old, holy, and true Church did agree, is necessary to be believed. But our controversy here,' (that is with the Romanists) 'is, whether any thing ought to be believed of necessity without the Scripture¹.'

So his great coadjutor Bishop Ridley : 'In that the Church of Christ is in doubt, I use herein the wise counsel of Vincentius Lirinensis, whom I am sure you will allow ; who, giving precepts, how the Catholic Church may be in all schisms and heresies known, writeth in this manner ; "When," saith he, "one part is corrupted with heresies, then prefer the whole world before that one part ; but if the greatest part be infected, then prefer antiquity²."'

Dr. Guest, who was appointed at the accession of Elizabeth, to restore the reformed Prayer-book, after it had been disused in the reign of Mary, and who reduced it to nearly its present form, writes thus : 'So that I may here well say with Tertullian, That is truth which is first : that is false which is after. That is truly first which is from the beginning. That is from the beginning which is from the Apostles. Tertullian, *Cont. Prax. Cont. Marc.*³'

Bishop Jewel in his Apology, which is all but an authoritative document, says : 'We are come as near as we possibly

¹ Cranmer, *On Unwritten Verities* ; Jenkyns' *Cranmer's Remains*, Vol. iv. p. 229. See also p. 126, and Vol. III. p. 22.

² Gloster Ridley's *Life of Ridley*, p. 613.

³ Guest to Sir W. Cecil, concerning the *Service Book*, &c. ; Strype's *Annals*, Vol. I. Appendix, No. XIV. ; also Cardwell's *Hist. of Conferences*, p. 52.

could to the Church of the Apostles, and of the old Catholic bishops and fathers: and have directed according to their customs and ordinances, not only our doctrine, but also the sacraments, and the form of common prayer¹.’

These passages sufficiently prove that our reformers admitted, and made use of the appeal to antiquity, in the interpretation of Scripture, and in the establishing of order and discipline. Their wisdom has been followed therein by all the great divines who have succeeded them. Joseph Mede, Hooker, Andrews, Hammond, Overal, Usher, Jeremy Taylor, Bull, Beveridge, Patrick, Waterland, Jebb, Van Mildert, G. S. Faber, and the present learned Bishop of Lincoln, have been respectively cited as upholding the same principle, and acting upon it².

In the words of the last-mentioned writer, ‘On the subject of religion, there appears to be a peculiar propriety in appealing to the opinions of past ages. In human science we find a regular advance from less to greater degrees of knowledge. Truth is elicited by the labours of successive enquirers; each adds something to the stock of facts which have been previously accumulated; and as new discoveries are continually made, the crude notions of those who first engaged in the pursuit are discarded for more matured and more enlarged views. The most recent opinions are those which are most likely to be correct. But in the case of a Divine revelation, this tentative process can

¹ *Apolog. Enchiridion Theolog.* p. 184; where see the original more at length.

² The student may especially be referred to Bp. Beveridge, Preface to his *Codex Canonum*; Patrick’s *Discourse about Tradition*, in the first Volume of Gibson’s *Preservative against Popery*; Dr. Waterland, *On the Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, ch. vii.; Bp. Jebb’s *Pastoral Instructions*—Chapter, *On the Peculiar Character of the Church of England*; Bp. Kaye’s *Tertullian*, p. 229. See also Rev. G. S. Faber’s *Primitive Doctrine of Justification*; and also *Primitive Doctrine of Election*. On Ecclesiastical Tradition, or tradition concerning rites and discipline, see Hooker, *E. P.* Bks. ii. and iii.; Bp. Marsh’s *Comparative View*, ch. vii.

have no place. They, to whom is committed the trust of communicating it to others, are thoroughly instructed in its nature and its objects, and possess a knowledge which no enquiries of subsequent ages can improve. What they deliver is the truth itself; which cannot be rendered more pure, though it may, and probably will, be adulterated in its transmission to succeeding generations. The greater the distance from the fountain-head, the greater the chance that the stream will be polluted. On these considerations is founded the persuasion, which has generally prevailed, that in order to ascertain what was the doctrine taught by the Apostles, and what is the true interpretation of their writings, we ought to have recourse to the authority of those who lived nearest to their times¹.

‘We allow,’ says Bishop Patrick, ‘that tradition gives us a considerable assistance in such points, as are not in so many letters and syllables contained in the Scriptures, but may be gathered from thence by good and manifest reasoning. Or, in plainer words, perhaps, whatsoever tradition justifies any doctrine, that may be proved by the Scriptures though not found in express terms there, we acknowledge to be of great use, and readily receive and follow it, as serving very much to establish us more firmly in that truth, when we see all Christians have adhered to it. This may be called a *confirming tradition*: of which we have an instance in Infant Baptism, which some ancient fathers call an Apostolical tradition.’ Again: ‘We look on this tradition as nothing else but the *Scripture unfolded*: not a new thing, but the Scripture explained and made more evident. And thus some part of the Nicene Creed may be called a tradition; as it hath expressly delivered unto us the sense of the Church of God, concerning that great article of our faith, that

¹ Bp. Kaye’s *Justin Martyr*, ch. i. p. 2. The bishop has satisfactorily shewn that the tradition appealed to by Tertullian in the second century was no other than the kind of tradition admitted by the English Church. See Bp. Kaye’s *Tertullian*, p. 297, note.

Jesus Christ is the Son of God, *begotten of His Father before all worlds, and of the same substance with the Father.* But this tradition supposes the Scripture for its ground, and delivers nothing but what the fathers, assembled at Nice, believed to be contained there and fetched from thence¹.

So Dr. Waterland: 'We allow no doctrine as necessary which stands only on fathers, or on tradition, oral or written. We admit none for such but what is contained in Scripture, and proved by Scripture, rightly interpreted. And we know of no way more safe in necessities, to preserve the right interpretation, than to take the ancients along with us. We think it a good method to secure our rule of faith against impostures of all kinds, whether of enthusiasm, or false criticism, or conceited reason, or oral tradition, or the assuming dictates of an infallible chair. If we thus preserve the true sense of Scripture, and upon that sense build our faith, we then build upon Scripture only: for the sense of Scripture is Scripture².'

It is indeed most necessary that we do not suffer our respect for antiquity to trench upon our supreme regard for the authority of Scripture. To Scripture we look as the only source of all Divine knowledge. But when we have fully established this

¹ Patrick, *On Tradition*, as above.

² Waterland, *On the Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, ch. vii. The note to this passage is as follows:

'So the great Casaubon, speaking both of himself and for the Church of England, and, at the same time, for Melanchthon and Calvin also: *Opto cum Melanchthone et Ecclesia Anglicana, per canalem antiquitatis deduci ad nos dogmata fidei, e fonte sacræ Scripturæ derivata.*—*Alioquin quis futurus est innovandi finis?*—*Etsi omnis mea voluptas est et sola versari in lectione sacræ Scripturæ, nullam tamen inde me hausisse propriam sententiam, nullam habere, neque unquam σὺν Θεῷ εἶπέν, esse habiturum.* Magni Calvini hæc olim fuit mens, cum scriberet præfationem suam in commentarium Epistolæ ad Romanos; non debere nos ἐν τοῖς Κυριωτάτοις, a consensu Ecclesiæ recedere.' A.D. 1611. Casaub. *Epist.* 744. *Dan. Heinsio.* p. 434. Edit. tertia Rotterdami.

principle, we need not fear to make use of every light with which God has furnished us, for the right understanding of Scripture; whether it be a critical knowledge of ancient languages, or history, or antiquities, or the belief of the primitive Christians, and the doctrines which holy men of old deduced from those sacred writings, which were to them, as to us, the only fountain of light and truth.

II. The Article having declared the sufficiency of Scripture, and set forth the Canon of Scripture; then speaks of those other books, which had been always held in high respect, but were not canonical, in the following terms:

‘The other books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners: but yet doth not apply them to establish any doctrine¹.’

The meaning of these words is, that the Church of God, in all ages, has been used to read the Apocrypha for example and instruction, but not for doctrine. This is a simple statement of fact, and if nothing more were said elsewhere, it would need no further explanation. But if we look to the Calendar of the Prayer-book, which was drawn up by the compilers of the Articles, and receiving, like the Articles, the assent of all the clergy of the Church; we find that, during a certain portion of

¹ Ἀπόκρυφα βιβλία or ἀπόκρυφοι βιβλοι, so called either because their authors were unknown; or because not laid up, like the Canonical books, in the ark; or because read in private only, not in public also; though it appears from the XLVIIth Canon of the Council of Carthage that some Apocryphal books were read publicly. Suicer. s. v. ἀπόκρυφοι. Tom. i. p. 458.

The passage of Hierom alluded to is probably: ‘Sicut ergo Judith et Tobit et Maccabæorum libros legit quidem Ecclesia, sed inter canonicas Scripturas non recipit, sic et hæc duo volumina (h. e. libros Sapientiæ et Ecclesiastici) legat ad ædificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem Ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam.’—Hieronym. in *Libros Salomonis, Chromatio et Heliodoro*. Tom. i. p. 938. Ed. Ben. Tom. iii. p. 39. Paris, 1602.

the year, in the week-day services, the first lesson is appointed to be read from the Apocrypha. This is acting on the principle laid down in the Article; and this is one of those customs of the Church of England, which has been most exposed to censure, from those who dissent from her, and from some even of her own children.

There may certainly appear some danger in ordering that to be read, as a lesson of the Church, which is not Canonical Scripture, lest it should be mistaken for Scripture; and it is moreover urged against the custom, that the Apocrypha not only is not inspired, but also contains some idle legends, and some erroneous doctrines; and therefore ought not to be admitted to be read in the Church. It is even added, that the Church of Rome has derived some of her errors from, and supports some of her false teaching by, the authority of the Apocrypha.

It may be well, therefore, to state the grounds on which, it is probable, that our reformers thought fit to retain the Apocryphal lessons, that we may see what is the weight of the objections urged against our Church on the ground of their use.

First, it has been replied to the principal objections, that if we would exclude all human compositions from the Church, we must exclude homilies, sermons, metrical psalms and hymns,—nay, prayers, whether written or extempore, except such as are taken out of Scripture itself,—that there is no danger that the Apocrypha should be mistaken for Scripture, when it is expressly assigned a far lower place, both in the formularies and in the ordinary teaching of the Church,—that, if it be not free from faults, no more is any human composition, and that on this principle we must still rather exclude sermons, psalms, hymns, and even liturgies,—that it is not true, that the Church of Rome has derived her errors from the Apocrypha, which does not support them, and by which she could not prove them; for

she has derived them from misinterpreting Scripture, from oral tradition, and from her own assumed infallibility¹.

So much is said in answer to the objections. Farther, in favour of the reading the Apocryphal books, their nature and history are alleged. The origin of them has been already alluded to. They were written in the period of time which elapsed between the return from captivity and the birth of Christ. The historical books of the Apocrypha, therefore, supply a most important link in the history of the Jewish people. Without them we should be ignorant of the fulfilment of many of the old Testament prophecies, especially of those in the book of Daniel; and should know nothing of several customs and circumstances alluded to in the new Testament, and essential to its understanding. The other books are mostly pious reflections, written by devout men who were waiting for the consolation of Israel.

The Alexandrian Jews received them with the most profound respect. The fathers often appeal to them, and cite them; though it has been shewn, they mostly knew the difference between them and the writings of Moses and the Prophets.

¹ The following is the answer of the Bishops to the exception of the Puritans at the Savoy Conference against the reading of the Apocrypha: 'As they would have no Saints' days observed by the Church, so no Apocryphal chapter read in the Church; but upon such a reason as would exclude all sermons as well as Apocrypha; viz. because the Holy Scriptures contain in them all things necessary either in doctrine to be believed, or in duty to be practised. If so, why so many unnecessary sermons? Why any more but reading of Scriptures? If, notwithstanding their sufficiency, sermons be necessary, there is no reason why the Apocryphal chapters should not be as useful,—most of them containing excellent discourses and rules of morality. It is heartily to be wished that all sermons were as good. If their fear be that, by this means, those books may come to be of equal esteem with the Canon, they may be secured against that by the title which the Church hath put upon them, calling them Apocryphal: and it is the Church's testimony, which teacheth us this difference, and to leave them out were to cross the practice of the Church in former ages.'—Cardwell, *Hist. of Conferences*, ch. vii. p. 342.

It appears that from very early times they were read in most Churches, at least in the West; as in very many were also read the Epistles of Clement and Barnabas, and the Shepherd of Hermas¹. Not that they were esteemed Canonical, but as of high antiquity and value, and useful for instruction to the people.

In Ruffinus we find a distinction between books Apocryphal and books Ecclesiastical². Among the former he classed those which were wholly rejected; among the latter, those which were read in Churches. His division therefore is threefold: Canonical, which embraces all those which we now receive into the Canon; Apocryphal, *i. e.* those which were altogether rejected; and Ecclesiastical, among which he reckons Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, Maccabees, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the like. This distinction occurs elsewhere, though some of the fathers make only a twofold division, into Canonical and Apocryphal³. Now the Ecclesiastical books are what

¹ Dionysius, a bishop of Corinth in the second century, in a letter to the Church of Rome (*ap. Euseb. H. E. III. 16*) says, 'they read on the Lord's day Clement's Epistle to them in their assemblies;' and Eusebius (*Id. IV. 23*) declares it to have been 'universally received, and read in most churches,' both in his and former times. The same he says of the Shepherd of Hermas (*Id. III. 3*), that 'it was read in many churches;' which is confirmed by Athanasius (*Epist. Paschal. XXXIX.*), and Ruffinus (*Exposit. in Symb. Apost. § 36*), both concerning this and other books.—Jones, *On the Canon*, Part I. ch. x.

² 'Sciendum tamen est, quod et alii libri sunt qui non Canonici, sed Ecclesiastici a majoribus appellati sunt; ut est Sapientia Salomonis, et alia Sapientia quæ dicitur filii Sirach, qui liber apud Latinos hoc ipso generali vocabulo Ecclesiasticus appellatur; quo vocabulo non auctor libelli sed Scripturæ qualitas cognominata est. Ejusdem ordinis est libellus Tobisæ et Judith et Maccabæorum libri. In novo vero Testamento libellus, qui dicitur Pastoris sive Hermatis, qui appellatur duæ viæ, vel judicium Petri; quæ omnia legi quidem in Ecclesiis voluerunt, non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandum. Ceteras vero Scripturas Apocryphas nominarunt, quas in Ecclesiis legi noluerunt.'—Ruffin. *in Symb. Apost. § 38*.

³ *E. g.* Cyril. *Cateches. IV. § 35*; where he calls all Apocryphal which are not Canonical.

we at this time call the Apocrypha; and, forming part both of the Latin and Greek versions of the old Testament, they continued to be read in most Churches, from the earliest ages to the time of the Reformation.

It was not peculiar to the English reformers to speak with respect of these books. The foreign reformers use similar language, citing them as a kind of secondary authority; and especially the Swiss and Belgic Confessions, which represent the opinions of the extreme Calvinist section of the Reformation, speak in terms of honour concerning them, the latter allowing them to be read in Churches¹. It may be added, that the Eastern Churches, which agree with us in the Canon, yet retain the Apocryphal books in their Bibles, and use them as we do.

One more argument ought not to be wholly omitted. The new Testament writers, even Our Lord himself, appear often to cite from the Septuagint. We must not consider this as giving full authority to all the books of the Septuagint. Such authority we have already shewn to belong only to the books of the Hebrew Canon. But it should appear, that such citations from the Septuagint would naturally commend to the Church the use of that volume as their Greek version of the Scriptures. But that Greek version contains all the Apocryphal books. If, then, they were so mischievous, or so to be rejected, as some argue, it is scarcely to be accounted for, that neither Our Lord nor any of His Apostles give any warning against them, whilst they quote, as of sacred authority, other portions of the volume which contains them.

¹ *Sylloge Confessionum. Confess. Helvet.* Art. i. p. 17. *Confess. Belgic.* Art. vi. p. 328. The latter runs thus: Differentiam porro constituimus inter libros istos sacros et eos quos Apocryphos vocant: utpote quod Apocryphi legi quidem in Ecclesia possint, et fas sit ex illis eatenus etiam sumere documenta, quatenus cum libris Canonicis consonant; ut nequaquam ea est ipsorum auctoritas et firmitas, ut ex illorum testimonio aliquod dogma de fide et religione Christiana certo constitui possit, &c.

These views, in the general, appear to have influenced our reformers to retain the Apocryphal books. They have removed them from the Sunday services, and forbidden them to be quoted as authority in matters of faith; but esteeming them as next in value to the sacred Scriptures, from the important information they contain, and from the respect which they have received from the earliest ages, they were unwilling to remove them from the place which they had so long occupied. The reformers were evidently not insensible to the evil of putting anything else on the same footing as the Canonical writings. But this danger, they justly esteemed, would be very small in the reformed Church. And experience has shewn that in this they were right in their judgment; for extreme respect for the Apocrypha has been a feeling in this country almost unknown. In this question, therefore, they appear to have adhered to the maxim, which often guided them in matters of doubt, a maxim quoted with so much approbation by the famous Apologist of the English Church, and which originated in the fathers of the Council of Nice: *ἔθῃ ἀρχαῖα κρατεῖτω*—*Let ancient customs prevail*¹.

¹ 'Cur id a nobis hodie audiri non potest, quod olim in Concilio Niceno, a tot Episcopis et Catholicis Patribus, nullo refragante, pronunciatum est *ἔθῃ ἀρχαῖα κρατεῖτω*.'—Juelli *Apolog. Enchiridion Theologicum*, p. 185.

On the question of the reading of the Apocrypha in churches, see Hooker, *E. P.* v. 20. Concerning the ancient custom of reading Apocryphal books, see also Bingham, *Eccles. Ant.* Bk. xiv. ch. iii. § 14, 15, 16.

The following are the words of a pious and judicious writer, closely attached to a school in the English Church, not particularly inclined to pay respect to the Apocrypha: 'Man is a creature of extremes. The middle path is generally the wise path; but there are few wise enough to find it. Because Papists have made too much of some things, Protestants have made too little of them.... The Papist puts the Apocrypha into his Canon; the Protestant will scarcely regard it as an ancient record, &c.'—Cecil's *Remains*, p. 364. London, 1830.

ARTICLE VII.

Of the Old Testament.

THE old Testament is not contrary to the new; for both in the old and new Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the Law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the Civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral.

De Veteri Testamento.

TESTAMENTUM vetus novo contrarium non est, quandoquidem tam in veteri quam in novo, per Christum, qui unicus est Mediator Dei et hominum, Deus et homo, æterna vita humano generi est proposita. Quare male sentiunt, qui veteres tantum in promissiones temporarias sperasse confingunt. Quanquam Lex a Deo data per Mosen (quoad ceremonias et ritus) Christianos non astringat, neque Civilia ejus præcepta in aliqua republica necessario recipi debeant, nihilominus tamen ab obedientia mandatorum (quæ Moralia vocantur) nullus quantumvis Christianus est solutus.

SECTION I.

HISTORY.

THE Article, as it now stands, is compounded of two of the Articles of 1552, viz. the sixth and the nineteenth. The sixth ran thus:

‘The old Testament is not to be put away, as though it were contrary to the new, but to be kept still: for both in the old and new Testaments everlasting life is offered to mankind only by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and

man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises.'

The nineteenth was as follows :

'The Law, which was given of God by Moses, although it bind not Christian men, as concerning the ceremonies, and rites of the same, neither is it required that the civil precepts and orders of it should be received in any commonweal: yet no man (be he never so perfect a Christian) is exempt and loose from the obedience of those commandments which are called moral; wherefore they are not to be hearkened unto, who affirm that Holy Scripture is given only to the weak, and do boast themselves continually of the Spirit, of whom (they say) they have learned such things as they teach, although the same be most evidently repugnant to the Holy Scripture.'

I. We may first consider, what persons have denied the doctrine contained in the original sixth Article, which forms the *first* part of our present Article; and then, who have been opposed to the statements of the original nineteenth Article; of which the substance is contained in the latter part of our present seventh Article.

1. First then, some early heretics held, that the old Testament was altogether contrary to the new.

The Gnostic sects, who believed in the malignity of matter, would not allow that the Creator of the world could be the Supreme God. Marcion especially appears to have distinctly taught, that the old Testament was contrary to the new, the former being the work of the Demiurge or Creator, the latter of the Supreme and invisible God. He is said to have composed a work called *Antitheses*, because in it he set, as it were, in opposition to each other, passages from the old and new Testaments, intending his readers to infer from the apparent disagreement between them, that the Law and the Gospel did not proceed from the same Author. Tertullian wrote a work

against Marcion, in the fourth book of which he exposes the inconsistency of this attempt¹. Similar opinions prevailed more or less among the Valentinians and other Gnostic sects, all of whom attributed the creation to inferior beings; and consequently rejected the old Testament.

The Manichees in like manner, who believed in two principles eternally opposed to each other, as they had views similar to the Gnostics concerning the evil of matter, so they resembled them in their disrespect to the old Testament Scriptures². And in this they were very probably followed by those medieval sects of heretics, the Bulgarians, Cathari, and others, who appear to have been infected with Manichean heresy³.

It is most probable, however, that the framers of this Article, both in the earlier and in the latter part of it, had in view some of the fanatical sects of the period of the Reformation, especially the Antinomians, who denied the necessity of obedience to the Law of God, and the Anabaptists, who referred all things to an internal illumination; and both of whom were likely to have denied the value and authority of the old Testament.

The opinion, that the fathers looked only for transitory promises, has been held not only by heretics and fanatics, but, more or less, by some, in the main, orthodox Christians. Bishop Warburton, in his famous work, *The Divine Legation of Moses*, has endeavoured to prove, that Moses studiously concealed from the Hebrews all knowledge of a future state; and this forms one of the arguments by which he strives to prove the inspiration and Divine authority of the Books of

¹ Tertull. *adv. Marcion*. Lib. iv.; Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, p. 499, &c.

² Deum, qui Legem per Moysen dedit, et in Hebræis prophetis locutus est, non esse verum Deum, sed unum ex principibus tenebrarum.—August. *De Hæres.* 46, Tom. viii. p. 16. See also Socrat. *H. E.* c. 22; Epiphan. *Hæres.* 66, c. 43; Lardner, *Hist. of Manichees*, Vol. III. ch. lxiii.

³ See Mosheim, *Ecc. Hist.* Cent. xi. Part II. ch. v. § 2, 3; Cent. xii. Part II. ch. v. § 4.

Moses. Though he allows that the later Jews, during and after the Captivity, had a gradually increasing knowledge of the immortality of the soul, yet as regards the earlier times of the Jewish commonwealth, he appears to have denied any such knowledge, even to the patriarchs and prophets¹.

II. By looking at the wording of the original nineteenth Article, it will appear plainly that the latter part of our present Article is chiefly directed against fanatics, who affirm 'that Holy Scripture is given only to the weak, and do boast themselves continually of the Spirit, of whom, they say, that they have learned such things as they teach.'

This claim to inward illumination, and consequent neglect of the teaching of Scripture, has constantly characterized fanatical sects in all ages. Those, against whom the words of the Article were directed, are generally supposed to be the Antinomians and the Anabaptists, who sprang up soon after the rise of the Reformation in Germany. The Antinomians were the followers of Agricola, who carried the doctrine of Justification by faith to the length of rejecting the necessity of moral obedience altogether². The Anabaptists were a constant source of annoyance to the Lutheran reformers. As their name implies, they rejected Infant Baptism, and rebaptized adults. But with this they combined a variety of noxious and fanatic doctrines, which rendered them dangerous both to Church and State. Claiming a high degree of internal illumination, they appear to have sanctioned and committed a number of excesses and crimes, under pretence of special direction and command from God³.

¹ See Warburton's *Divine Legation*, Book v. § 5, 6.

² Mosheim, Cent. xvi. Sect. iii. Part ii. ch. i. § 25.

³ See a history of them, Mosheim, Cent. xvi. Sect. iii. Part ii. ch. iii. Mosheim also, in the preceding chapter, gives an account of a sect of Libertines calling themselves Spiritual Brothers and Sisters, who sprang

It seems that this Article also incidentally alludes to some persons, who would have retained not only the moral, but the ceremonial part of the Mosaic Law. This of course must have been true of all the early Judaizing Christian teachers. In the history given of the doctrine of the first Article, we have seen that some part of the Eastern Church was materially corrupted with these Judaizing tendencies. The observance of the Jewish Sabbath, or Saturday, the quartodeciman mode of calculating Easter, and similar observances, have been already mentioned, as examples of this kind.

As regards the belief that Christian commonwealths ought to be regulated after the model of the Jewish polity, and according to the civil precepts of the old Testament, it seems likely that the Anabaptists of Munster, who seized on that city and set up a religious commonwealth among themselves, endeavoured to conform their regulations in great measure to the laws of the Jewish economy¹.

In later times, in Great Britain, the Puritans, at the period of the great Rebellion, were constantly using the language of the old Testament, as authority for their conduct in civil affairs, and as a guide for the administration of the Commonwealth.

It is highly probable that, at the period of the Reformation, the whole question concerning the agreement of the old with the new Testament was a good deal debated. The prominent manner in which the subject of Justification was then brought forward, naturally suggested topics of this kind. When men were

up among the Calvinists in Flanders, and against whom Calvin wrote. They held that religion consisted in the union of the soul with God, and that such as had attained to such a union were free from the restraints of morality. All ages have been more or less infected by such fanatics. They naturally flourished in a time of such religious excitement as the Reformation.

¹ See Mosheim, as above.

told, in the strongest terms, that there was not, and could not be, any hope of salvation to them but by faith in Christ ; and that this was altogether independent of any merits of their own, and could not be obtained by works of the Law ; it obviously and naturally occurred to them to enquire, How then were the fathers under the old Testament saved ? *They* had never heard of Christ, and could not be saved by faith in Him. They had only a law of works for their guidance. Can then the old Testament be contrary to the new ?

SECTION II.

SCRIPTURE PROOF.

IN endeavouring to shew the correspondence of this Article of our Church with the truth of Scripture, it will be desirable to consider the subjects of it in the order already adopted in speaking of their history.

I. First, We may consider the statement, that eternal life is offered to mankind, in the old as well as in the new Testament, through Jesus Christ; and that the fathers looked for more than transitory promises.

II. Secondly, we may treat of the questions concerning the abrogation of the civil and ceremonial, and concerning the permanency, of the moral Law.

I. Now we shall find it more convenient to treat the first division of our subject in the following order:

1 To consider the nature of the Law of Moses, and the reason why eternal life is not more clearly set forth as one of its promises.

2 To speak of the promises, in the old Testament, of a Mediator and Redeemer.

3 To shew that under the old Covenant there was a hope among the pious of a future state and life eternal.

1 The character of the Law of Moses was peculiar to itself. God chose the people of Israel to be His own kingdom on earth. There were reasons, some known only to God, others revealed to us, why for two thousand years it pleased Him to

preserve His truth amid surrounding idolatry, by committing it entirely to one chosen race. That people He constituted His own subjects, and ruled over them as their Sovereign and Lawgiver. The Jewish commonwealth, therefore, was neither a Monarchy under the Kings, nor an Aristocracy under the Judges, but it was always a Theocracy. The people had properly no king but God. Moses was His vicegerent; so was Joshua. And after them the Judges exercised, from time to time, more or less of the same delegated authority. In the time of Samuel, the people, in a spirit of unbelief, asked for the presence of a visible king; and thereby greatly sinned against God, as dissatisfied with His invisible empire, and rebelling against the Government He had established over them. He however consented to grant them a temporal ruler, an earthly king. Yet the king so appointed did not rule in his own name, but as the viceroy and lieutenant of the Lord of Hosts, the God of the armies, the King of the kingdom of Israel.

All the laws then were ministered in His name. All the sanction of those laws had reference to Him, as Ruler and Lawgiver. The Tabernacle, and afterwards the Temple, were not simply places of worship; they were rather the Royal Palace, as Jerusalem was the city of the Great King. In the Temple His throne was the mercy-seat, and between the attendant Cherubim He was present in the cloud of glory, to be approached with the homage of incense and prayer, and to be consulted as to His pleasure by His chief minister, the High Priest, with the Urim and Thummim.

Accordingly, the Law given by Moses was the constitution and statute-book of the Theocratic commonwealth. It was indeed a guide for the life and manners of the people; but it was their guide, especially as they were subjects of the temporal government of the Lord. The Almighty is, in His own nature and His own will, unchangeable; and therefore the laws which regulate morality must ever be the same. Hence when

for a time He assumed the government of a temporal kingdom, murder, theft, adultery, and other crimes against justice, mercy, truth, and purity, were forbidden and punished, as a thing of course. But, over and above this, when God became the King of the nation, certain sins against Him became not only moral, but civil offences. Idolatry was high treason, and direct rebellion. It was not, therefore, as in general, left to the judgment of the hereafter, but was proceeded against at once, as a state-crime of the highest magnitude, and punished immediately with temporal death.

The like may be said concerning the destruction of God's enemies, the Amorites, the Amalekites, the Philistines, and others. They were the foes of the King of Israel, and were to be exterminated accordingly.

So again, much of the ceremonial of the Law constituted the state ceremonial of the Invisible King. The earthly sovereign, the priests and the Levites, were His court and His ministers. Custom and tribute were paid to Him, as they would have been naturally paid to the rulers in all the kingdoms of the world.

Now such being the case, we may understand at once why all the sanctions of the Law are temporal, and not eternal. In many instances, indeed, the punishments denounced were to be executed by the civil magistrate. There were rules laid down as to the administration of justice by the inferior officers in the commonwealth of Israel. But in other cases the vengeance denounced is to be executed, not by the inferior magistrate, but by the supreme Head, the King of Israel Himself. Yet still the principle is the same. Whether the King Himself is to be the judge, or the priest, or the magistrate, the reason for the judgment is the same. And accordingly God, who was their King, interfered, not as in other nations by an ordinary Providence, but signally and manifestly, by direct, obvious, miraculous interposition. The obedient subject was rewarded by his boun-

tiful Sovereign with long life and peace and prosperity; the disobedient was smitten with sickness, afflicted with poverty, or struck down by death.

If, at any time, the nation became generally disobedient, Prophets were sent to it, who were messengers from the King, to exhort His subjects to preserve their allegiance and return to their duty. Even they, like the Law itself, spoke to the people, for the most part, as subjects of the temporal kingdom of the LORD, and admonished them of the danger of not submitting themselves to their lawful Sovereign.

Whether then we look to the Law or to the Prophets, we can see good reason why neither eternal life nor eternal death should be the sanction set forth, and the motives pressed upon the people. The Jewish dispensation was in every way extraordinary. We often mistake its nature by viewing it as if it were the first full declaration of God's will to man; whereas the patriarchal religion had already existed for full two thousand years before it; and the Law was 'added' (*προστέθη*, Gal. iii. 19) to serve only for a time, and for a peculiar purpose. Its object, at least its direct and apparent object, was, not to set forth the way of eternal life, but to be the statute-law of the Theocracy, and to subserve the purposes of a carnal and preparatory dispensation, wherein the knowledge of God, and the hopes of a Messiah, were preserved amid the darkness of surrounding heathenism, till the day dawned, and the day-star arose.

The Jews, indeed, who were contemporary with Christ and His Apostles, vainly supposed that the Law of Moses had in it a life-giving power. They stumbled at that stumbling-stone, for they sought eternal salvation, 'not by faith in Christ, but as it were by the works of the Law' (Rom. ix. 32). Whereas the Law was not given for that purpose; but with an object remarkably different from that. 'If, indeed, a law had been given, which was capable of giving life, then would righte-

ousness (or justification) have been by the Law¹. But Law, though essential for the regulation of manners, is, of its own nature, incapable of giving eternal salvation; for he who obeys its ordinances can, at most, but deserve to escape from its penalties. And this is still more emphatically true of men polluted by sin and compassed by infirmity. For law provides no propitiation, and offers no spiritual aid. There must therefore have been something more than law to save men from eternal ruin; and the Jew, by imagining that the Law could do this, failed altogether of the righteousness of faith.

Even the sacrifices under the Law had but a temporal efficacy. They served 'for a carnal purifying' (*πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα*, Heb. iv. 13). They satisfied for offences against the temporal Majesty of the Great King, and skreened from the temporal punishment due to all transgressions of the Law which He had enacted. But there was no profession, no promise whatever, that they should satisfy for the sin of the soul. Indeed, for the heavier offences there was no propitiation set forth at all; whether these offences were against the King or against His subjects. For murder and adultery, for idolatry and blasphemy, there was nothing left 'but a certain fearful looking for of judgment.' 'The blood of bulls and of goats could never take away sin;' 'could never make the worshipper perfect as pertaining to the conscience.'

2 But, beyond all this, there was still another purpose for which the Mosaic economy was designed. 'The Law was a schoolmaster to bring us to Christ.' It was a dispensation professedly preparatory, and imperfect. It was, therefore, so constructed by Infinite Wisdom, that there should be an inward spirit vastly dissimilar from the outward letter of the Law. Accordingly the whole dispensation, as it was prepa-

¹ Gal. iii. 21. *Εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος ζωοποιῆσαι, ὥτως ἀνέκ νόμου ἦν ἡ δικαιοσύνη.*

ratory, so it was typical. The kingdom of Christ is the great antitype of the old Theocracy. The Church is a Theocracy now, as much as Israel was then. And so all the ordinances of the temporal kingdom were types and images of the blessings of the spiritual kingdom. To this end, as well as to their *immediate* object, served the priests and the temple, the altar and the sacrifices, the tribute and the incense, and all the service of the sanctuary. The *letter* then of the Law could never offer salvation; but the *spirit* did. Nay! the letter of the Law was necessarily condemnatory, as it gave more light and brought more obligations; but neither satisfied for transgressions, nor gave inward sanctification. And so it is written, 'The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life' (2 Cor. iii. 6). The letter brought no promise of immortality, but left men under condemnation; but the spiritual meaning of the Law led men to Christ, and so gave them life.

It will not be necessary to go through the promises of the old Testament, and the types of the Law, to shew that there was a promise of a Mediator, and of redemption from the curse which Adam had brought upon us. The promise to Adam of the seed of the woman—the promise to Abraham that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed—the promise to David concerning his son, who should sit upon his throne—the types of the passover, the scape-goat, the sacrifices on the day of atonement, the consecration of the high priest,—the prophecies of David, of Isaiah, of Daniel, of Zechariah, of Malachi,—all readily occur to us, as containing predictions, or exhibiting figures, which set forth to the enlightened understanding the hope of future deliverance, and of a Redeemer, who should turn away iniquity.

It is said most truly, that all this was involved in much obscurity; and it can never be denied, that the Jew had a much less clear understanding, a much more partial revelation of 'the truth as it is in Jesus,' than the least instructed member of the

Christian Church. Nay, 'the least in the kingdom of heaven,' in the Gospel dispensation, 'is greater' in knowledge 'than he who was greatest' before the coming of Christ. But it should not be forgotten, that during the patriarchal ages, God had revealed Himself to Adam, and Enoch, to Noah and Abraham, and perhaps to many besides. We are not to suppose that the light of such primeval revelation, which guided men for more than twenty centuries, was of a sudden quenched in utter darkness. The traditionary knowledge concerning a promised Mediator was no doubt carefully cherished, and served to enlighten much which in the Law, and even in the Prophets, might have been otherwise unintelligible. And hence the Mediator, though but faintly shadowed out, was yet firmly believed in. We have our Lord's assurance, that 'Abraham rejoiced to see His day; he saw it and was glad' (John viii. 56). We have St. Paul's assurance, that the same Abraham, having received the promise of the Redeemer, believed in it, and was justified by faith¹. And we may well suppose that the faith, which guided Abraham, guided others, both before and after him.

At first indeed, and whilst patriarchal tradition yet survived, the intimations of a Mediator in the ancient Scriptures are less distinct and less intelligible. But among the later prophets, when that early tradition may have had less weight, and when the day of Christ was more nearly approaching, the promises may be read more plainly, and the Gospel-history be almost deciphered in the sacred emblems of prophecy.

3 Are we then to suppose, notwithstanding this, that the fathers looked only for transitory promises?

It is a truth which, I think, cannot be denied, that Moses does not bring prominently forward the doctrine of a future state. It was a subject which did not fall in with his purpose.

¹ Rom. iv. 1—20. Gal. iii. 6—9, 14—19.

His mission was to organize the Jewish commonwealth, and embody in writing the statute-law of the Theocracy. That Theocracy, as has been said, was a temporal kingdom, though God was its King. Hence, naturally he does not bring forward the doctrine of a future life¹. In addition to the writing of the laws of Israel, Moses gives also a brief, a very brief, sketch of the history of the nation, and of its more illustrious ancestors. It is probable enough, that no very frequent allusion to a future existence might occur in this history; and it is only in the historical, not at all in the legislative writings, that we can expect to meet with it. It has been already explained, that even the prophets, who succeeded Moses, acted much as messengers from the Sovereign of Israel to His rebellious subjects, and hence naturally spoke much concerning obedience to His Law and the sanctions of that Law, which we know were temporal. Yet in many of the prophets, clear notice, not only of a Mediator and a hereafter, but perhaps even of a Resurrection, are to be met with. Even Bishop Warburton, though strongly maintaining that the earlier Jews had no knowledge of a life to come, yet admits that in later times they became fully acquainted with the truth of it.

The principal passages in the books of Moses which seem to prove that the patriarchs believed in an eternity, and that a knowledge of it was general in the days of Moses himself, are as follows :—

(1) The account of the translation of Enoch, Gen. v. 24. This account indeed is brief and obscure. We know, however, from other sources what it means, and its obscurity rather seems to argue that it was, as is most likely, a fact generally known and well understood, and so not needing to be longer

¹ Bp. Warburton asserts that he studiously conceals it. This requires more proof than the Bishop has given. Eternal life was not a sanction of the Law, and therefore does not appear in it. It does not follow that it was purposely concealed.

dwelt upon. But its obscurity is a little magnified ; for we clearly enough learn from the passage that, whereas in general long life was a promised blessing, yet in the case of Enoch a still greater blessing was conferred. For, whereas all other persons in the same chapter are spoken of as living long and then dying, Enoch's is said to have been comparatively a short life, and then it is said that, because of his piety, God took him. ' Enoch walked with God ; and he was not, for God took him.' It is hard to know what other sense could be attached to the passage, except that given it by St. Paul : ' Enoch was translated that he should not see death' (Heb. xi. 5). Now people, who knew of the translation of Enoch, must have known something of that state of bliss to which he was removed.

(2) Accordingly, Jacob on his death-bed utters an ejaculation utterly unconnected with the immediate context ; ' I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord' (Gen. xlix. 18). What salvation Jacob could have waited for, who in this very chapter looks forward to far future fortunes for his children, before ' the Shiloh should come, and to Him should be the gathering of the people,' except it were the salvation of his own soul, which he was just about to breathe forth, has never been clearly explained.

(3) Balaam was so well acquainted with the truth (though so little obedient to it), as ' to wish to die the death of the righteous, and that his last end should be like his' (Num. xxiii. 10.) Now the promise of the Law was to the *life* of the righteous ; the promises of temporal blessing must all affect life rather than death. It is natural for a believer in a blessed immortality to wish for such a death and such a last end as awaits the just. But from a person, who believes all God's promises to be made to this life, and looks forward to no life beyond, such an exclamation seems hardly intelligible.

(4) There is a saying of Moses himself, which seems probably to imply the same thing. Just before his death he says

of Israel, 'Oh that they were wise, that they understood this, that they would consider their latter end.' It is, undoubtedly, not certain that אַחֲרִית, 'latter end,' here, means *death*. Perhaps it should be said, it *probably* does not mean *death*: but it means either *futurity*, or *final condition*. And, though we may allow that the force of the passage is not unquestionable, its most natural interpretation would be, that it was a wish that the people of Israel were thoughtful of that time, when worldly objects of interest should pass away, and their end draw nigh, when wisdom and piety only should profit them.

We come next to the famous passage in the Book of Job¹. As the words stand in our Authorized Version, they prove Job's belief not only in a future life, but in a resurrection of the body: 'Oh that my words were now written! Oh that they were printed in a book! That they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever! For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that He shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this

¹ The date and authorship of the Book of Job is a question in some degree affecting the question in the text. Most scholars consider the book as one of the earliest in the Bible; and many have believed that it was written by Moses. Bp. Warburton argues that it was not written till the captivity, or the return from captivity; and that it is a dramatic composition rather than a real history (*Divine Legation*, Bk. VI. Sect. II.) The question is not to be settled with a few words. I can only say that it appears to me to bear the marks of great antiquity. It is true that it is not such pure Hebrew as some parts of the old Testament; or rather that it contains a great many Hebrew words and phrases which are not common in the other books of the Bible, and for the explanation of which we must look to the Syriac and Arabic languages. But the style is very little like the style of the later books, which contain a certain number of Chaldaisms and even some Chaldee; such as Daniel, Ezra, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, and some of the Psalms. The Aramaisms of Job are very unlike these; and so is the whole style and character of the Hebrew. It is indeed exactly what might be expected from a very ancient writer, who wrote in Hebrew an account of dialogues originally held in an ancient dialect of Arabic. Whether or not Moses was that writer is another question. It seems very doubtful, if not highly improbable.

body, yet in my flesh shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me.' (Job xix. 23—27.)

There are, without doubt, difficulties in this translation. The passage is in many points obscure, though not more so than the book of Job in general. The more literal rendering of the last three verses is, perhaps, as follows:

'For I, even I, know that my Redeemer liveth, and hereafter shall stand above the dust. And though, after my skin, this (body) be destroyed, yet from my flesh shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and no stranger; my reins are consumed within me.'

On the whole, whatever rendering is given to it, it is hardly possible that the passage should not *appear* to prove a belief in a future existence. The words, 'from my flesh,' indeed may be interpreted differently, according to the different senses attached to the preposition; and whereas our translators have rendered it '*in* my flesh,' some eminent scholars have maintained that we should render it '*without* my flesh¹.' Yet the only difference, which such a different interpretation might cause, would be,

¹ So Rosenmüller. Præfixum בְּ ante בְּשָׁרִי significat defectum, ut Isai. xlix. 15, *An obliviscetur mulier filioli sui מִרְחֶם resecta miseratione, i. e. ut non misereatur ejus.* 1 Sam. xv. 26, *Rejecit te Deus מֶלֶךְ מְדֻיּוֹת ut non sis rex.* Ita בְּשָׁרִי accurate respondet priori hemistichio, ut utroque corpus suum dissolvi significet (Schol. in Job xix. 26). Whether the use of בְּ in the passages thus adduced from Isaiah and Samuel is at all similar to the use of the same preposition in this passage of Job, others must decide. To me it appears that there is little or no analogy. To reject a person "*from* being king,"—to "*forget* a child *so as not* to love it,"—are vastly different notions of the preposition בְּ from that sought to be attached to it here, viz. "*without* my flesh." Rosenmüller, having given this sense to the preposition, is obliged to say that it is only by a strong poetical figure that Job is said to see his Redeemer '*without* his flesh,' signifying merely that, though much wasted with disease, he yet hoped to live to see his cause defended, and his uprightness vindicated. Should we venture to apply such criticism to any profane author?

that, according to the first, Job hoped to see his Redeemer at the *Resurrection*; according to the latter, that he expected the same glorious vision as a disembodied spirit.

It is however argued, that it is very remarkable, that no indication, save this, of a belief in an immortality occurs in the book of Job. It would be natural, it is said, when Job's friends charge him with wickedness, and attribute his sorrows to his sins, that he should at once answer, that, though miserable in this life, he yet had full hope of happiness in a better. As therefore no such reasoning is to be found, we must necessarily conclude that Job was ignorant of a future state; and that this particular passage instead of being an anticipation of a future Resurrection, is a prophetic declaration of his belief in what actually afterwards took place; namely that, though for a time the disease which afflicted him was permitted to destroy his body, yet, in the end, God should be manifested to defend his cause, and that he should be permitted to see Him with his own eyes.

I am inclined to attribute but little weight to the previous silence of Job concerning the life to come. It was the general belief in his days, that a special Providence brought good upon the righteous, and evil on the wicked in this life; and in the earlier days of the Jewish commonwealth it doubtless was so. Job shares this belief with his friends; yet he is conscious of his integrity, and defends himself earnestly against their accusations. It is hardly likely that he should have tried to disprove the justice of a creed which he held himself. Therefore he does not say that they were wrong in believing in a retributive Providence, or urge them to look forward from this life to a better. This would have been in Job an improbable and unnatural course. But from the singular solemnity with which he ushers in the passage in question, the hope that he expresses, that it may 'be printed in a book,' nay, recorded 'in the book for ever,' we may well believe, that he is about to give utter-

ance to something different from what he has hitherto been speaking of, and to something so important that he wishes it to be preserved, not only for his own time, as a solemn assertion of his innocence, but that it should be handed down to all future generations, as a vital and an eternal truth.

Now nothing could be more appropriate than such an introduction, if Job were about to speak of the general Resurrection, and his hope that he should be comforted and vindicated then. That was an argument unlike any he had urged before, and it was a truth of universal and constant interest, so that he might well wish to have the words which spake of it 'printed in a book, yea, graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever.'

It is true, there are expressions in the book of Job which may be interpreted into a denial of the doctrine of a future existence. For instance, 'As the cloud is consumed and vanisheth away, so he that goeth down to the grave shall come up no more' (Job vii. 9). 'So man lieth down, and riseth not : till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep' (Job xiv. 12). And again, (ver. 14) 'If a man die, shall he live again?' Bishop Warburton lays great stress on these passages, as proving that Job was ignorant of a Resurrection, and even of a future state. But, in all fairness, do they mean any more than this, that if a man die, he shall live no more in this life ; if he goes down to the grave, he shall come up no more, while this world is remaining ? This interpretation fully satisfies the force of all the expressions, even of that strongest of all, 'man lieth down, and riseth not ; till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake.' Nay, we may almost venture to say, that this last expression has a more than commonly Christian sound ; for the new Testament teaches us that the general Resurrection at the last day shall not be till 'the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat.' (2 Pet. iii. 10, comp. Rev. xx. 11). It may be

added, that the very verse which follows this passage in Job (a passage which is thought so decisive against his belief in a here-after) appears to carry with it a refutation of such a theory; for in that verse (Job xiv. 13) the patriarch prays that God 'would hide him in the grave (לִישְׁכָּה in *Hades*), and keep him secret till His wrath was past; that He would appoint him a set time, and then remember him.' What could be the meaning of God's hiding him in Hades, or in the grave, till His wrath was past, and then after a set time remembering him, if such language was used by one who knew nothing of life and immortality? For the word *Sheol*, be it observed, whatever diversity of opinion there may be concerning it, has never been supposed by any one to mean anything which is unconnected with the state of the dead. It must be either the grave, or the state of departed souls. Choose which we will; Job wishes for a temporary concealment in the grave, or in the state of the departed, and then to be remembered, and, we can scarce fail to infer, to be raised up again.

With such a hope and such an expectation, will well correspond such expressions as, 'Though He slay me, yet will I trust Him' (Job xiii. 15). But how shall we interpret them if they be the language of one whose hopes were all bounded by this life?

In the book of Psalms, David in a passage, which we know to be prophetic of Messiah, speaks as follows: 'I have set the Lord always before me; because He is at my right hand I shall not be moved. Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory¹ rejoiceth; yea my flesh also shall rest in confidence². For Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades, neither wilt Thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption. Thou wilt shew me the path of life:

¹ כְּבוֹדִי 'My glory,' probably a poetical expression for the *heart* or the *soul*. See Gesenius, s. v.

² לְבִטָּח in confidence, securely.

in Thy presence is the fulness of joy : at Thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore.' (Ps. xvi. 8—11).

In the ears of a Christian such language is so plainly expressive of the hope of resurrection, that it is difficult to attach any other meaning to it. Nay, we know that St. Peter quotes it as a prophecy that Christ should be raised from the dead, His soul not resting in Hades, His body not turning to corruption (Acts xi. 25—31). The passage then, according to the Apostle's comment on it, actually did mean a resurrection. The only question is, Did the Psalmist, when he wrote it, so understand it ; or did he write of common things, unconsciously to himself and through the guidance of the Spirit, speaking deep mysteries ? It is possible that the latter may have been the case. And yet the words chosen seem to make it improbable. Why does he say, after speaking of the gladness of his heart, and the rejoicing of his spirit, that 'even his *flesh* should rest in confidence ?' This looks much like an assurance that not only the heart might rejoice in God, but even that the body had hope of immortality. And then, 'Thou wilt not *leave* my soul in hell.' Had he meant, that he should not be permitted to die, it would have been natural to say, 'Thou wilt not *bring me down* to hell.' But he, who hopes not to be *left* in Hades, must surely have expectation of first going thither. The words therefore of themselves so plainly imply a resurrection, and are so apparently chosen for the purpose of expressing the hope of a resurrection, that, though we may admit that profound ignorance on the subject may have kept the prophet from understanding them, and have blinded his eyes that he should not see their sense, yet nothing short of this would have hindered him, who uttered the language, from feeling inspired with a hope full of immortality¹.

¹ It must be remembered that those persons who think Job and David and others ignorant of a future state, yet admit, nay contend, that all their

Again, the view which David takes elsewhere of the difference between the end of the righteous and of the wicked, is consonant with a hope of a future retribution; and otherwise is unintelligible. (Ps. xxxvii. 37, 38). ‘Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright: for the end of that man is peace. But the transgressors shall be destroyed together: the end of the wicked shall be cut off.’

In like manner his confidence in trial and troubles, when the wicked prosper and the just are oppressed, has at least a striking resemblance to the language of one who looks for a time when the just shall be delivered, and the wicked consumed in judgment.

Thus in Psalm xxiii. 4, David says, ‘Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me.’ To ‘walk through the valley of the shadow of death,’ is probably but a poetical phrase for ‘to die;’ and to those who looked only for temporal blessings death would be well nigh the greatest ‘evil.’ Hence he who could die, and yet ‘fear no evil,’ must have had a hope after death. So in Psalm lxxiii., if this were David’s, then David, but if not, then Asaph, who is not likely to have known more than David, having spoken of his having envied the wicked, when he saw them in prosperity, and when he found himself chastened and afflicted, concludes in this manner: ‘Thus my heart was grieved, and I was pricked in my reins. So foolish was I, and ignorant; I was as a beast before Thee. Nevertheless I am always with Thee; Thou hast holden me by my right hand. Thou shalt guide me with Thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory’ (Ps. lxxiii. 21—24).

neighbours round about were fully cognisant of such a doctrine. (See Warburton, Bk. v. § v.) How then came it to pass that Job, who was an Arab, and David who was a conqueror, and had dwelt among the Philistines, and become acquainted with many peoples, should use language concerning a tenet which they almost must have heard from neighbouring nations, and yet not understand it themselves?

The 'glory' is not of necessity glory everlasting; but it is hardly necessary to observe that such a sense of the word suits the context better than any lower interpretation of it¹.

As David thus seems to have had hopes of something after death; so his son Solomon knew that 'when a wicked man dieth, his expectation shall perish' (Prov. xi. 7); that 'The wicked is driven away in his wickedness, but the righteous hath hope in his death' (Prov. xiv. 32). But what hope has the righteous more than the wicked, or how does the expectation of the wicked, more than that of the just, perish when he dieth; unless there be a something after death which gives hope to the one, but takes it away from the other? Again, Solomon tells us (Eccles. xii. 7), that at death 'shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it;' signifying, as it plainly seems, that when the body returns to that from which it was taken, the spirit shall return into the hand of Him who gave it, not perishing with the body, but awaiting the judgment of its God².

When we come to the prophets, it is scarcely denied by

¹ There are, no doubt, some expressions in the Psalms, which seem to imply an ignorance of a future life, *e. g.* :

'In death there is no remembrance of Thee; in the grave who shall give Thee thanks?' (Ps. vi. 5.) 'Shall the dust praise Thee? shall it declare thy truth?' (Ps. xxx. 9.) 'Wilt Thou shew wonders to the dead? shall the dead arise and praise Thee? shall thy lovingkindness be declared in the grave, or thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall thy wonders be known in the dark, and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?' (Ps. lxxxviii. 10—12.)

These are certainly remarkable expressions; but they do not appear unaccountable in a person who had been taught by the dispensation under which he lived, to look for temporal blessings as a reward for obedience, even though he was a believer in a future state. It is doubtful whether such language might not be used even by a Christian. Death is certainly a part of the curse; and hence there is no wonder if the pious Jew dreaded it. And speaking concerning the silence of death does not necessarily imply a total disbelief in a resurrection. The silence and forgetfulness may mean only forgetfulness as regards this world.

² On this passage see Bishop Bull, *Works*, Oxf. 1827, Vol. i. p. 29. Bishop Warburton's strongest passage is from Ecclesiastes:

any that we meet with a mention of immortality. Bishop Warburton, who is probably the ablest writer, at least in the English language, in favour of the opinion that the early Jews knew nothing of a future state, yet admits that in the prophetic writings we begin to see some clear intimations of that doctrine which was to be fully brought to light in the Gospel.

Two remarkable passages are the following (Isai. xxvi. 19): ‘Thy dead men shall live; together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead.’ It is not necessary to determine whether there be here a distinct prophecy of the Resurrection. It is enough to shew that Isaiah, and those he wrote for, believed in a Resurrection, if, to express even something else, he uses words to illustrate it, which, in their most natural sense, imply a Resurrection. When we use a figurative expression, we borrow the figures which we use from things familiar and understood among us.

In the book of Daniel a description is given, which so exactly corresponds with the Christian description of the last Judgment and the general Resurrection, that it must require

‘The living know that they shall die; but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a *reward*: for the memory of them is forgotten.’ Eccles. ix. 5. The book of Ecclesiastes is one the language of which is singularly obscure. The passage in question, if taken in its context, may, however, be interpreted with no great difficulty. The royal Preacher observes that there is one event to all men, from which none shall escape; and whatever good things he may enjoy in this life, yet death will surely soon deprive him of them all. This may naturally embitter earthly enjoyments, for the living know that they shall die, and they may be assured that in death they will lose their consciousness of all things that have given them pleasure here, and receive no more reward or emolument (שִׂכָּר) from them. ‘Their love and hatred and envy perish; and they have no longer a portion in anything that is done under the sun.’ Now this seems the obvious meaning of the passage beginning ver. 2 and ending ver. 6. Does this prove that Solomon did not believe in a future life? It is plain that he is speaking only of man’s losing by death their good things and consciousness of enjoyment *in this life*.

the greatest ingenuity to give any other sense to it: 'At that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever' (Dan. xii. 1—3).

We have already seen (under Art. III.) that the Jews, who lived at the time of our Saviour, with the exception of the sect of the Sadducees, not only believed in the immortality of the soul, but in a Resurrection, and in an intermediate state between death and Judgment. Thus St. Paul's appeal, when he was brought before the Sanhedrim, was agreeable to all, except the sect of the Sadducees: 'Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee; of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question.' And the reason of this was, that, though the small and heretical sect of the Sadducees 'said there was no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit;' yet the more orthodox, and more extensive sect of the 'Pharisees confessed both' (Acts xxiii. 6, 8).

There may have been sufficient obscurity in the old Testament Scriptures to admit of the possibility of the existence of two different sects, the one holding, the other denying, a future immortality; yet there is abundant evidence from the new Testament, that the true interpretation was that adopted by the Pharisees, and that the Sadducees erred from ignorance and pride. Our Lord indeed, when the Sadducees came to Him and propounded to Him a difficulty concerning the Resurrection, tells them at once that they 'erred, not knowing the Scriptures' (Matt. xxii. 29). And though the passage which our Lord adduces from the books of Moses (Exod. iii. 6), 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob,' requires some explanation to shew that it proved the

doctrine in question; yet it is quite plain that our Lord reproves the Sadducees for dulness in not having learnt from the old Testament, that 'all men live to God.'

But the passage in the new Testament, which most fully assures us that the ancient fathers looked for heavenly promises, is the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the first twelve verses the Apostle had been speaking of the faith of Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Sarah, and perhaps of Isaac and Jacob; and he then adds (vv. 13—16), 'These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims upon earth. For they that say such things, declare plainly that they seek a country. And truly, if they had been mindful of that country, from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. But now they desire a better country, that is an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God, for He hath prepared for them a city.' In like manner (vv. 25, 26), he tells us that Moses chose 'rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt, *for he had respect unto the recompence of the reward.*' And other saints of the old Testament, he says, 'were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain *a better resurrection.*' Now those 'who seek a better country, that is, a heavenly,' those who despise the pleasures of sin, and choose to suffer through life persecution with the people of God, 'having respect to the recompence of reward,' those who endure torture, 'not accepting deliverance,' that 'they may obtain a better resurrection,' must certainly have looked for more than transitory promises, even for those very promises of life and immortality which they indeed saw but afar off, but which at length the Lord Jesus by the Gospel fully brought to light.

It may seem unnecessary to add any thing farther to shew that the old Testament is not contrary to the new. Yet it is worth while to remark, that the constant quotation of the old Testament by the writers of the new, and their mode of quoting it to confirm and ratify their own teaching, is abundant proof that the one closely corresponds with the other. Our Lord expressly asserts, that the old Testament Scriptures are 'they which testify of Him' (John v. 39). The people of Berea are spoken of with high commendation, because they searched the old Testament to see whether the preaching of the Apostles was the truth; and we read, that they were so convinced by this daily searching of the Scriptures, that many of them were led to believe (Acts xvii. 11, 12). Nay, St. Paul tells Timothy that those Scriptures of the old Testament, which he had known from a child, 'were able to make him wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.' 2 Tim. iii. 16.

It is certain therefore that they who wrote, and He in whose name they wrote the Scriptures of the new Testament, so far from holding that the old Testament was different from the new, ever held and taught its entire agreement, and appealed to the old Testament as the strongest confirmation of their doctrines, and as bearing abundant testimony to their sacred mission and their heavenly inspiration.

II. But though the old Testament is not contrary to the new, yet, 1. the ceremonial of the Jewish Law is abolished; but, 2. the commandments called moral still continue in force.

1 The very end and object of the Jewish ceremonial were such that of necessity it must have passed away. It has already been seen that the Law of Moses was, first, the code of statute-law for the Theocratic commonwealth; and secondly, a system of types and emblems, preparatory to the coming of the Messiah, who was to fulfil them all. These two purposes it served, so long as these purposes existed. But now the Jew-

ish Theocracy has given place to the Christian Church ; and the great Antitype has come, to whom all the typical ceremonies looked forward. There is now therefore no longer any reason for the continuance of the Mosaic Law. Moses and Elias, the Law and the Prophets, have passed away, and we see no one but Jesus only, to whom we are to listen, as God's beloved Son.

There cannot be at present any kingdom circumstanced as the kingdom of Israel was. God is no longer an earthly Sovereign, reigning exclusively over the Jewish nation as their temporal King. He is indeed the Great King in all the earth, but not the particular Ruler of a single commonwealth. The Lord Jesus sits on His Mediatorial Throne. But His is a spiritual dominion. It is indeed that great fifth empire which Daniel saw imaged by a stone hewn without hands, which in course of time filled the earth. But it is nevertheless a kingdom not of this world ; and therefore His servants are not to fight, nor to call down fire from heaven on their enemies, nor to take the sword, lest they perish by the sword. The weapons of their warfare are not carnal ; their citizenship is in Heaven ; their fellow-citizens are the saints ; their fellow-subjects the household of God.

It is therefore unfit that any kingdom should be governed by the laws, or regulated by the ceremonial of the Jewish polity. The court of an earthly sovereign must be differently ordered from the court of the King of Heaven ; the laws which relate to all the governments of this world, different from those which had reference to the supremacy of the Lord. We have seen that blasphemy, idolatry, and similar offences, were under the Jewish economy not merely crimes against religion : they were also distinctly crimes, and that of the highest character, against the state. They tended to nothing less than the dethroning of the King, and putting an usurper in His room. It is therefore clear that, on principles of civil justice, they were

crimes which deserved to be punished with death. But in modern nations they are religious, not civil offences ; and though the magistrate may justly restrain such acts or words as tend to the offence of society, or the endangering of morality, yet he would not be justified in proceeding against the blasphemer or the idolater, on the principle on which the magistrate was bound to proceed against them in Israel, where their crimes were both civil and religious, derogatory to the honour of God, and at the same time rebellion against the authority of the state. Religious wars and religious persecutions are both utterly alien from the spirit of Christianity. James and John, who would have called down fire, Peter, who smote off the ear of Malchus, both thought and acted in the spirit of the Jewish, not of the Christian economy ; and were herein types of the Dominicans, who would convert or destroy by the rack and the flame, and of the zealots of later times, who, in fighting for religious liberty, shouted as their war-cry, ‘The sword of the Lord and of Gideon !’

We know well how strongly St. Paul condemns those who adhered to the Jewish ceremonial. Our Lord, indeed, had declared that ‘one jot or tittle should not pass away till all was fulfilled¹.’ But all was fulfilled when the sceptre departed from Judah, and so the Jewish commonwealth was dissolved ; and when the types of the Law had their full accomplishment in their great Antitype, our Prophet, Priest, and King. The argument of the whole Epistle to the Galatians is directed against the observance of Jewish ceremonies. The Epistle to the Hebrews equally shews that the Law had ‘waxed old, and was ready to vanish away,’ and that its accomplishment being perfected in Christ, there was no longer benefit to be gained by adhering to it. Indeed, in the Epistle to the Galatians the Apostle declares, that if a man is circumcised, and strives to

¹ Matt. v. 18.

keep the Law (*i. e.* the ceremonial Law of Moses), Christ has become of no effect to him, he is fallen from grace¹.

But, thus clear though it be that the ceremonial Law is no longer binding on a Christian, or on a commonwealth, we ought yet to bear in mind, that the organization of the Jewish state proceeded from above. It was, in some degree, a model republic. It was, no doubt, in a particular age of the world, under peculiar circumstances, and with a special object, that the Jewish nation was set apart to be God's peculiar people, His own kingdom upon earth. But, taking all these into account, we ought still to be able to derive lessons of political wisdom from the ordinances appointed by the Allwise for the government of His own chosen race. We can never again see a constitution and a statute-law devised by infinite Wisdom. We know, from our Lord's own words, that in some respects the enactments of the Mosaic economy, though coming from God, were yet not perfect, because of the hardness of heart of those for whom they were designed²; and therefore, of course, we must take into account, not only the particular circumstances, but also the particular character of the people; but, when we have made such allowances, we may rest assured that the commonwealth of Israel would be the fittest pattern and type which legislators could adopt for the government of empires³.

¹ Gal. v. 4.

² Matt. xix. 8.

³ The spiritual nature of Christ's kingdom does indeed preclude the notion of its being a religion of ceremony. We must not, however, run into the extreme of supposing, that, because the temporal or carnal ceremonies of the Mosaic law were done away in Christ, therefore all outward ordinances are inconsistent with Christian worship. We must remember that man is a creature compounded of soul and body, and therefore needing outward as well as inward agency. Accordingly, our Lord ordained Sacraments, and a ministry; and the Apostles enjoined ordinances of public worship, and exercised ecclesiastical discipline; all which are essential to the existence of a Church in this world, though they may be unnecessary in that city 'where there shall be no temple; for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb shall be the temple of it.'

2 As regards that portion of the Law of Moses which is called moral, we must plainly perceive that it is founded in the eternal principles of justice and truth. It is not a code of enactments, given for the temporary guidance of a temporary government. It is rather a system of moral precepts, for the direction and instruction of rational and accountable beings. Indeed, as God was the King of Israel, moral obedience was in itself a portion of civil obedience. Yet the principle, from which its obligation resulted, was not the relation of a subject to his king, but the relation of a creature to his God. The former was a temporary relation, existing only whilst the Jewish commonwealth should last; the other is an eternal relation, which must endure for ever and ever. The moral Law, then, which is God's will, was, like Himself, holy, and perfect, even as He is perfect. And St. Paul, when he speaks of it as incapable of justifying, yet carefully guards against any misapprehension of his words, as though he should be supposed to speak disparagingly of the Law itself. He declares that 'the Law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good' (Rom. vii. 12). He says that 'the Law is spiritual,' and the reason why it could not sanctify man was not its own deficiency, for in itself, and for its own end, it was perfect, but because of the weakness and sinfulness of man; because the natural man is 'carnal, sold under sin,' and so unable to fulfil the Law; and the more perfect the Law, the more unable man is to live up to it (Rom. vii. 14). But that it is still binding upon Christians, appears sufficiently from the same Apostle's reasoning, who, when he has shewn that by nature man cannot obey the Law, goes on just after to assert, that what could not be done by man's natural weakness, could be, and was done, by the power of God; even 'that the righteousness of the Law should be fulfilled in them, who walked not after the flesh, but after the Spirit' (Rom. viii. 4).

Our Lord, in the Sermon on the Mount, not only shews

that the moral law is binding on Christians, but shews, moreover, that it is binding in a much stricter and more spiritual sense than was generally understood by the Jews. It had been taught in the Law, that we should not commit adultery. But Christ enjoined that we should not suffer an impure look, or an unholy thought (Matt. v. 27, 28). It had been taught in the Law that we should do no murder. But Christ taught that the angry feeling and the angry word, which are the first steps to violence, and might in some cases lead to murder, were breaches of that commandment, and therefore unfit to be permitted in Christian men (Matt. v. 21, 22). The ordinances of the Law were expressed in terms of simple command and prohibition, and were looked on in a light suited to the carnal nature of the dispensation in which they were given. The Pharisees, who were jealous for the Law, yet mostly looked no farther than the letter, satisfied, if they abstained from absolute violation of its negative, and fulfilled the literal injunctions of its positive precepts. But our Lord told His disciples, that except their righteousness exceeded such righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, they should in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven (Matt. v. 20). His was a spiritual kingdom, and He required spiritual obedience. Mere formal compliance with the ordinances of the Law was insufficient for a Christian, whose heart must be brought into captivity to the will of God. Yet because the obedience must be spiritual, it did not follow that it should not be real. On the contrary, it was to be more real, yea, more strict. For subjection to the spirit of the Law, necessarily involves subjection to the letter; though obedience to the letter does not of necessity produce obedience to the spirit. A man may cherish lust and anger, without their breaking forth into murder and adultery. But, if he checks every rising of evil, he cannot be guilty of the more deliberate wickedness. The first step cannot be arrested, and yet the last plunge be taken.

But if there could be any question as to our Saviour's teaching, one sentence alone should set it at rest: 'Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of Heaven' (Matt. v. 19).

It is most true that some of the moral commandments are accompanied by sanctions, which have respect to the state of things under the Jewish Theocracy. For example, the fifth commandment enjoins obedience to parents, with the promise, 'that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.' But this by no means proves that the injunction is not binding upon all. All we can learn from it is, that, beyond the sanctions by which the eternal will of God is upheld in all religion, natural or revealed, the Jew, as a subject of the Theocracy, had also temporal promises to be expected as the reward of obedience; which, from the peculiar nature of the Mosaic economy, were constantly put prominently forward. And in the case of this particular commandment, St Paul expressly enjoins all Christian children to observe it, on the very ground that it was a commandment of the Law of God. And he adds, as a special motive for attending to this commandment, that it must plainly have been an important commandment, inasmuch as in the Law it was the first to which a promise was specially attached. 'Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right. Honour thy father and mother, which is the first commandment with promise; that it may be well with thee, and that thou mayest live long on the earth' (Eph. vi. 1, 2, 3). The Apostle first enjoins the duty, quotes in confirmation of his injunction the words of the commandment, and then shews the peculiar importance of that commandment, by pointing out that, under the Mosaic economy, a special promise of blessing was annexed to it. This by no means shews that we

are to fulfil this commandment, in hope of that peculiar promise; but it shews that the commandment is binding on Christians as well as upon Jews; and that it is binding because it is a part of the moral Law given by God to man, which is in itself unchangeable—as unchangeable as He who gave it.

ARTICLE VIII.

Of the Three Creeds.

THE three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius's Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.

De Tribus Symbolis.

SYMBOLA tria Nicenum, Athanasii, et quod vulgo Apostolorum appellatur, omnino recipienda sunt, et credenda, nam firmissimis Scripturarum testimoniis probari possunt.

SECTION I.

OF CREEDS IN GENERAL.

THE Church, after having defined the authority to which she appeals for the truth of her doctrines, proceeds to require belief in those formularies of faith which, from very early times, had been in constant use in the Church universal, and that upon the principle already laid down, viz. that they are in strict accordance with holy Scripture.

It seems generally admitted, that the probable origin of Creeds is to be traced to the form or confession of faith which was propounded to the Catechumens previously to their baptism. In the Scriptures such forms appear to have been brief. Our Lord commanded that men should be baptized 'in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,' and perhaps a confession in some such simple form as, 'I believe in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost,' was all that was at first required. Indeed, Philip required of the Eunuch no more than a profession of a belief, that 'Jesus Christ was

the Son of God¹.’ It is probable that the Apostles and their immediate disciples used several Creeds, differing in form, though not in substance. Hence, no certain form existing, all Churches were at liberty to make their own Creed, as they did their own liturgies, not being tied to a particular form of words, so long as they kept to the analogy of faith and doctrine delivered by the Apostles. Then, as heretics arose, who denied the fundamental doctrines of the faith, the Creeds became gradually enlarged, to guard the truth from their insidious designs and false expositions.

Dr. Grabe, who examined the question as to what forms were used even in the Apostles’ days, came to a conclusion, that all the articles in the Creed commonly called the Apostles’ Creed, were in use in the Apostolic Confessions of faith, with the exception of these three, ‘the Communion of Saints,’ ‘the Holy Catholic Church,’ and ‘the descent into Hell².’

Many confessions of faith are to be found, nearly corresponding with the Creeds which we now possess, in the writings of the earliest fathers. For example, in Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, the Apostolic Constitutions³. We have also Creeds of several different Churches preserved to us, agreeing in substance, but slightly varying in form; as the Creed of Jerusalem, Cæsarea, Alexandria, Antioch, Aquileia⁴,

¹ See King, *On the Creed*, p. 33; Wall, *On Infant Baptism*, Vol. II. Part II. chap. IX. § X. p. 439.

² Bingham’s *Eccles. Antiq.* Book x. ch. III. § 6, 7. It is not to be supposed, because these Articles do not occur in the most ancient copies of the Creed, that they were therefore of comparatively modern invention. There is abundant testimony to the doctrines expressed by them in the earliest ecclesiastical writings. Evidence of this may be seen as regards one of them, ‘The descent into Hell,’ under Art. III.

³ These are given at length in Wall, as above; and in Bingham, Book x. ch. IV.

⁴ See them at length in Bingham, as above.

&c. But until the time of the Council of Nice, there does not appear to have been any one particular Creed, which prevailed universally, in exactly the same words, and commended by the same universal authority.

The prevalence, however, of some authoritative standard in the Church, although varied by diversity of expression, is apparent from the language of many of the earliest Christian writers. Thus Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and others, speak of a ‘Canon, or rule of faith, according to which we believe in one God Almighty, and in Jesus Christ His Son, &c.’ And it is quite clear that this *Κανὼν ἀληθείας*, or *Regula fidei*, was no other than the Creed of the Church, expressed in a regular formulary¹.

The commonest name by which the Creed was designated was that of *Σύμβολον*, or *Symbolum*. The meaning of the term is confessedly obscure. (1) It has been said to have arisen from the fact that the twelve Apostles met together, and each contributed (*συνέβαλον*) one article to the Creed; hence called *Symbolum*, or collation. (2) It has been said to mean a Collation, or Epitome of Christian doctrine. (3) It has been supposed to be, like the *Tessera Militaris* among the Roman soldiers, a symbol, or sign, by which the soldiers of the Cross were distinguished from heathens or heretics. (4) It has been thought again, that it was borrowed from the military oath (*sacramentum*), by which the Roman soldiers bound themselves to serve their general². (5) And lastly, Lord King has suggested that it may have been borrowed from the religious services of the ancient heathens, who gave to those who were initiated into their mysteries certain signs or marks (*symbola*),

¹ See Bingham, Bk. x. ch. iii. § 2; Bp. Marsh, *Lectures*, Camb. 1828, p. 470; see also the meaning of the term, ‘Rule of faith,’ discussed under the last Article.

² *Symbolum cordis signaculum, et nostræ militiæ sacramentum.*—Ambros. Lib. iii. *De velandis Virginibus*, apud Suicer.

whereby they knew one another, and were distinguished from the rest of the world¹.

It is not very easy to decide which of these five senses may with most propriety be attached to the word. The first is the least probable, inasmuch as the tradition on which it rests appears not to have existed before the 4th Century².

The word 'Creed,' by which these ancient formularies of faith are designated in English, is derived from the word *Credo*, with which the Nicene and Apostles' Creed commence.

¹ Suicer, voc. Σύμβολον.—Bingham, Bk. x. ch. iii. King, *On the Creed*, pp. 6, 11, &c. Wheatley, Dr. Hey, and others, have adopted King's derivation. Bingham totally rejects it.

² St. Augustine says the name was given 'quia symbolum inter se faciunt mercatores, quo eorum societas pacto fidei teneatur. Et vestra societas est commercium spiritualium, ut similes sitis negotiatoribus bonam margaritam quærentibus.'—Serm. ccxii. *Oper.* Tom. v. p. 985. Paris. 1683.

SECTION II.

THE APOSTLES' CREED.

RUFFINUS mentions a tradition, handed down from ancient times, that after our Lord's ascension, the Apostles having received the gift of tongues, and a command to go and preach to all nations, when about to depart from one another, determined to appoint one rule of preaching, that they should not set forth diverse things to their converts. Accordingly, being met together, and, inspired by the Holy Ghost, they drew up the Apostles' Creed, contributing to the common stock what each one thought good¹. The author of the *Sermons de Tempore*, improperly ascribed to Augustine², tells us that 'Peter said, I believe in God the Father Almighty; John said, Maker of Heaven and earth; James said, Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary; Philip said, Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried; Thomas said, He descended into Hell, the third day he rose again from the dead; Bartholomew said, He ascended into Heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; Matthew said, From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead; James the son of Alphæus said, I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church; Simon Zelotes said, The Communion of Saints, the Forgiveness of sins; Jude the brother of James said, The Resurrection of the flesh; Matthias concluded with, The Life Everlasting.'

¹ Ruffinus, *Expositio in Symb. Apost. ad calcem Cypriani*, p. 17, Oxf. 1682; King, p. 24; Bingham, Bk. x. ch. iii. § 5. Bingham translates, 'each one contributing his sentence;' but Ruffinus' words are 'conferendo in unum quod sentiebat unusquisque.'

² Serm. *De Tempore*, 115; *Augustini Opera*, Paris. 1683, Tom. v. Append. p. 395, Serm. ccxli.

The principal objections to the truth of these traditions, which are fatal to the last, and nearly fatal to the other, are these :—

First, that Ruffinus himself tells us the article of the descent into hell was not in the Roman (*i. e.* the Apostles'), nor in the Eastern Creeds. It has been proved by Archbishop Usher, and Bishop Pearson, that this statement is true; and also that two other articles, 'the Communion of Saints,' and 'the Life Everlasting,' were wanting in the more ancient Creeds.

Secondly, the formation and existence of the Creed is not mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, nor in any of the more ancient fathers or Councils; which is most extraordinary, if any such formulary was known to have existed, a formulary which would have had the full authority of Scripture itself, and would therefore, probably, have been continually appealed to, especially in Councils where new confessions of faith were composed.

Thirdly, it is plain that the ancient Creeds, though alike in substance, were not alike in words; which could never have been the case, if one authoritative form had been handed down from the Apostles¹.

Fourthly, we may add to this, that the ancients scrupulously avoided committing the Creed to writing; and it is hardly probable, if there was in the Church a deposit so precious as a Creed drawn up by the Apostles, that it would be left to the uncertainty of oral tradition, nor that, if it were so left, it would have been preserved in its perfect integrity².

But though this Creed was not drawn up by the Apostles themselves, it may well be called Apostolic, both as containing the doctrines taught by the Apostles, and as being in substance the same as was used in the Church from the times of the Apostles themselves. This will appear to any one who will

¹ See Suicer, s. v. Σύμβολον; King, p. 26; Bingham, Bk. x. ch. iii. § 5.

² See Aug. *Opera*, Tom. v. p. 938; see also King, p. 31.

compare it with the various ancient forms, preserved in the works of the most ancient fathers, and which may be seen in Bingham, Wall, and other well-known writers already referred to¹.

It was, no doubt, 'the work neither of one man nor of one day;' yet it is probable that the Apostles themselves used a form, in the main agreeing with the Creed as we now have it; except that the articles concerning the descent into hell, the communion of saints, and the life everlasting, were most likely of later origin. The form, indeed, was never committed to writing, but, being very short, was easily retained in the memory, and taught to the catechumens, to be repeated by them at their baptism. It differed in different Churches in some verbal particulars, and was reduced to more regular form, owing to the necessity of guarding against particular errors. The form most nearly corresponding to that now called the Apostles' Creed, was the Creed of the Church of Rome; though even that Creed lacked the three clauses mentioned above². And it is an opinion, not without great probability, that the reason why it was called Apostles' Creed was, that the Church of Rome being the only Church in the West, which could undeniably claim an Apostle for its founder, its see was called the Apostolic See, and hence its Creed was called the Apostolic Creed³.

It is hardly necessary here to enter into any exposition, or proof from Scripture, of the different clauses of the Apostles' Creed. Most of them occur in the Articles of the Church of England. The few which are not expressed in them may be more profitably considered in regular treatises on the Creed, than in a necessarily brief exposition of the Articles.

¹ Suicer, Bingham, and Wall, as above; Pearson, at the head of every Article in his *Exposition of the Creed*.

² Bingham, Bk. x. ch. III. § 12.

³ Wall, *On Infant Baptism*, Part II. ch. IX. p. 472. Oxford, 1835.

SECTION III.

THE NICENE CREED.

WHEN the Council of Nice met A. D. 325, summoned by the authority of the Emperor Constantine, Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, recited to the assembled fathers the Creed which he professed to have received from the bishops which were before him, into which he had been baptized, even as he had learned from the Scriptures, and such as in his episcopate he had believed and taught. The form of it was as follows:—

‘ We believe in One God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, the only-begotten Son, begotten before every creature (*Πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως*, Col. i. 15); begotten of the Father before all worlds, by whom all things were made; who for our salvation was made flesh, and conversed among men, and suffered, and rose again the third day, and ascended to the Father, and shall come again with glory to judge the quick and the dead. And we believe in the Holy Ghost.’

This confession of faith both Constantine and the assembled bishops unanimously received; and it should seem, that this would have been all that was required. But Arius himself, soon after the Council, A. D. 328, delivered a Creed to the Emperor, which was unobjectionable, if viewed by itself, but which studiously omitted any thing which might have led him either to express or to abjure his most heretical opinions¹; viz.

¹ Arius’ Creed runs thus:—

‘ We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ His Son our Lord, begotten of Him before all ages, God the Word, by whom all things were made that are in Heaven and that are in earth:

that there was a time when the Son of God was not, that He was made out of nothing, and that He was not of one substance with the Father. This shews that there was an absolute necessity that the Council should word its Confession of faith, not only so as to express the belief of sound Christians, but also so as to guard against the errors of the Arians. Accordingly, the symbol set forth by the Council was in these words :—

‘ We believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only begotten, that is, of the substance of the Father ; God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, Begotten, not made ; being of one substance with the Father : By whom all things were made, both things in Heaven and things in earth ; who, for us men and for our salvation, came down, and was incarnate, and was made man : He suffered, and rose again the third day : and ascended into Heaven : and shall come again to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost.

‘ And those who say, that there was a time when He was not ; or that before He was begotten He was not ; or that He was made out of nothing ; or who say that the Son of God is of any other substance, or that He is changeable or unstable, these the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematizes¹.’

The Nicene Creed thus set forth, and the decrees of the Council against Arius, were received by the whole Church

who descended, and was incarnate, and suffered, and rose again, and ascended into Heaven, and shall come again to judge the quick and the dead : and in the Holy Ghost ; and in the resurrection of the flesh, and in the life of the world to come, and in the kingdom of Heaven ; and in one Catholic Church of God, from one end of the earth to the other.’—Socr. *II. E.* Lib. i. c. 26 ; Suicer voc. Σύμβολον ; Bingham, Bk. x. ch. iv. § 10 ; Wall, Part iv. ch. ix. p. 453.

¹ The Greek may be seen in Routh's *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Opuscula*, Tom. i. p. 251 ; and in Suicer, voc. Σύμβολον ; also *Athanasii Opera*, Tom. i. p. 247, *Epist. ad Jovian.* Colon. 1686.

throughout the world, and thus marked by the stamp of Catholicity. Athanasius, in A. D. 363, informs us, that all the Churches in the world, whether in Europe, Asia, or Africa, approved of the Nicene faith, except a few persons who followed Arius¹.

It appears to many that this Creed of the Council of Nice was but an abridgement of the Creed commonly used in many parts of the Church, and that the reason why it extended no further than to the Article, 'I believe in the Holy Ghost,' was, because it was intended to lay a stress on those Articles concerning our Lord to which the heresy of Arius was opposed. Epiphanius, who wrote his *Anchorate* some time before the Council of Constantinople, says that every catechumen repeated at his baptism, from the time of the Council of Nice to the tenth year of Valentinian and Valens, A. D. 373, a Creed in the following words:—

'We believe in One God, the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible: and in the Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds, that is of the substance of His Father, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made, both things in Heaven, and things on earth; who for us men and for our salvation came down from Heaven, and was incarnate of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, and was made man, and was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate; He suffered and was buried; and rose again the third day according to the Scriptures, and ascended into Heaven; and sitteth on the right hand of the Father; and He shall come again with glory to judge the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end.

¹ Καὶ ταύτης σύμψηφοι τυγχάνουσι πᾶσαι αἱ πανταχοῦ κατὰ τόπον Εκκλησίαι παρέξ ὀλίγων τὰ Αρείου φρονούντων.—*Epist. ad Jovian*, Tom. I. p. 246. See Palmer, *On the Church*, Pt. IV. ch. IX. § 1.

‘ And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets. And in one Catholic and Apostolic Church. We acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins, We look for the Resurrection of the dead, and the Life of the world to come. Amen.

‘ And those who say there was a time when He was not, or that He was made out of nothing, or from some other substance or essence, or say that the Son of God is liable to flux or change, those the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematize.’

This Creed Epiphanius speaks of, as handed down from the Apostles, and received in the Church, having been set forth by more than 310 Bishops, (the number at Nice being 318)¹.

It has also been observed that Cyril of Jerusalem, who died A. D. 386, and delivered his Catechetical Lectures early in his life, in the eighteenth lecture repeats the following Articles as part of the Creed: ‘ In one Baptism of repentance for the remission of sins, and in one Holy Catholic Church; and in the Resurrection of the flesh; and in eternal Life².’

We must infer then, either that a larger, as well as a shorter Creed, was put forth at Nice, such as Epiphanius has recorded, or that such a longer form had existed of old time, and that the Council only specified those parts which bore particularly on the controversy of the day; or lastly, that shortly after the Council of Nice, the Nicene fathers, or some of them, or others who had high authority, enlarged and amplified the Nicene symbol, and that this enlarged form obtained extensively in the Church³.

The Council of Constantinople met A. D. 381, consisting of 150 fathers. Their principal object was to condemn the

¹ Epiphanius, *In Anchorato*, juxta finem; Suicer, s. v. σύμβολον; Bingham, Bk. x. ch. iv. § 15.

² Cyril, Catech. xviii.

³ See Suicer and Bingham, as above.

Macedonian heresy, which denied the Deity of the Spirit of God. They accordingly put forth an enlarged edition of the Creed of the Council of Nice. It agreed almost word for word with the Creed of Epiphanius, the only omission being of the following clauses, 'that is of the substance of His Father,' and 'both things in Heaven and things in earth;' which were already fully expressed in other words.

The clauses contained in this Creed, which do not occur in the Creed as put forth by the Council of Nice, are as follows:—

'Begotten of the Father before all worlds,' 'By the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary,' 'Was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate,' 'Sitteth on the right hand of the Father,' 'Whose kingdom shall have no end;' and all those clauses which follow 'We believe in the Holy Ghost.'

The most important of these expressions is 'The Lord, and Giver of life.' The Arians spoke of Him as a creature. The Macedonians called Him a ministering spirit. In opposition to these, in the Creed of Constantinople, after an expression of belief in the Holy Spirit τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, is added τὸ Κύριον, 'the Lord.' This was in allusion to 2 Cor. iii. 17, 18, where the Spirit is spoken of as the Lord, (i. e. *JEHOVAH*); and is called 'The Lord the Spirit¹;' and therefore in this Creed He is called τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Κύριον, 'the Spirit, which is the Lord².'

It is unnecessary to repeat here what was said in the History of the Fifth Article, concerning the famous addition of the *Filioque*; which was the chief cause of the schism of the Eastern and Western Churches.

The Creed of Constantinople was solemnly confirmed by the third general Council, the Council of Ephesus, A. D. 431;

¹ ὁ δε Κύριος τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐστίν, and ἀπὸ Κυρίου Πνεύματος.

² See Wall, *On Infant Baptism*, Vol. II. p. 465.

whose seventh Canon decrees that ‘No one shall be permitted to introduce, write or compose any other faith, beside that which was defined by the holy fathers assembled in the city of Nice, with the Holy Ghost¹.’

It is said that the first to introduce the Constantinopolitan Creed into the Liturgy was Peter Fullo, Patriarch of Antioch, about the year 471; and that he ordered it to be repeated in every assembly of the Church². It is further said, that Timothy, Bishop of Constantinople, first brought the same custom into the Church of Constantinople, about A. D. 511.³ From the East the custom passed into the Western Churches, and was first adopted in Spain by the Council of Toledo, about A. D. 589, when that Church was newly recovered from an inundation of Arianism. The Roman Church appears to have been the last to receive it, as some say not before A. D. 1014; though others have assigned, with probability, an earlier date⁴.

¹ Beveridge, *Synodicon*, Vol. I. p. 103; Routh's *Opuscula*, Vol. II. p. 392.

² Πέτρον φησὶ τὸν κναφέα ἐπινοῆσαι . . . καὶ ἐν πάσῃ συνάξει τὸ σύμβολον λεγέσθαι.—Theodor. Lector. *Hist. Eccles.* Lib. II. p. 566, Paris. 1673; Bingham, Bk. X. ch. IV. § 7; Palmer's *Origines Liturgicæ*, Vol. II. ch. IV. § 6.

³ Theodor. Lector. p. 563; Bingham and Palmer, as above.

⁴ Bingham and Palmer, as above.

SECTION IV.

THE CREED OF ST. ATHANASIUS.

I. **T**HE origin of this, as of the Apostles' Creed, is obscure. In former times, many learned men believed it to have been composed by Athanasius, when he was at Rome, and offered by him to Pope Julius, as a confession of his faith. This was the opinion of Baronius, and in it he was followed by Cardinal Bona, Petavius, Bellarmine, Rivet, and many others of both the Roman and the reformed communions¹. The first, who entered critically into an examination of the question of its authorship, was Gerard Vossius, in his work *De Tribus Symbolis*, A. D. 1642; who threw strong doubts on the received opinion, having given good reason to believe that this Creed was the work not of Athanasius, but of some Latin writer, probably much posterior to Athanasius. Indeed, he did not set it higher than A. D. 600. He was followed by Archbishop Usher, who in his tract *De Symbolis* (A. D. 1647) produced new evidence, of which Vossius was ignorant, agreed with him in denying it to Athanasius, but scrupled not to assign it a date prior to the year 447.

In the year 1675, Paschasius Quesnel, a learned French divine, published the works of Pope Leo, with some dissertations of his own. In the fourteenth of these, he discusses the authorship of this Creed, and assigns it to Vigilius Tapsensis, an African Bishop, who lived in the latter end of the fifth century, in the time of the Arian persecution by the Vandals. His arguments have so prevailed, as to carry a majority of learned writers with him; amongst whom may be mentioned Cave, Dupin, Pagi, Natalis Alexander, Bingham.

The principal arguments against the authorship of Athana-

¹ Bingham, Bk. x. ch. iv. § 18.

sus, and in favour of Vigilus, are thus summed up by the last-mentioned writer, Bingham. 'First, because this Creed is wanting in almost all the MSS. of Athanasius' works. Secondly, because the style and contexture of it does not bespeak a Greek, but a Latin author. Thirdly, because neither Cyril of Alexandria, nor the Council of Ephesus, nor Pope Leo, nor the Council of Chalcedon, have even so much as mentioned it in all they say against the Nestorian or Eutychian heresies. Fourthly, because this Vigilus is known to have published several others of his writings under the borrowed name of Athanasius, with which this Creed is commonly joined¹.'

In 1693, Joseph Antelmi, a learned divine of Paris, in his *Dissertatio de Symbolo Athanasiano*, attacked with great success the opinion of Quesnel, and ascribed the Creed to Vincentius Lirinensis, who flourished in Gaul, A. D. 434.

His arguments appear to have produced considerable effect on the learned world. The famous Tillemont (1697) commends the performance of Antelmi, though still inclining to Quesnel's opinion. Montfauçon (1698) is convinced that the Creed is not the work of Athanasius nor Vigilus, nor is he convinced that it was Vincentius'; but thinks there is great reason to conclude that it was the work of a Gallican writer or writers, about the time of Vincentius. In like manner Muratori, a famous Italian writer (1698), commends the opinion of Antelmi, as nearest to the truth².

Lastly, our own learned Dr. Waterland, in his valuable *History of the Athanasian Creed*, having given an account of the opinions of his predecessors, brings many strong arguments to prove that the writer was Hilary, who became bishop of Arles A. D. 429, and that he, in all probability, put forth this creed, when he first entered his diocese.

¹ Bingham, as above; Waterland, *Hist. of Athanasian Creed*, ch. I.

² Waterland, as above.

The arguments by which the time and place, in which this Creed was written, have been pretty certainly arrived at, may be classed under two heads : 1 External ; 2 Internal Proofs.

1 External Proofs are as follows :

(1) We have ancient testimonies as early as the
A. D. 670. Council of Autun, A. D. 670, where this Creed is enjoined to be recited by the clergy. After this, Regino, Abbot of Prom in Germany, A. D. 760. The Council of Frankfort, A. D. 794. Theodulph, Bishop of Orleans, A. D. 809. Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, A. D. 852, &c.

(2) There is an *ancient commentary*, as early as
A. D. 570. A. D. 570, by Venantius Fortunatus, an Italian, who became Bishop of Poitiers. Afterwards commentaries by Hincmar, Bishop of Rheims, A. D. 852 ; Bruno, Bishop of Warzburgh in Germany, A. D. 1033 ; the famous Abelard, 1120, &c.

(3) There are MSS. as early as the seventh cen-
A. D. 600. tury, and one was found in the Cotton Library by Archbishop Usher, as early as A. D. 600 ; though this has since disappeared. This is a very early date, considering how few MSS., even of the most ancient writers, are much earlier.

(4) There are *French versions* of the year 850 ;
A. D. 850. German 870 ; Anglo-Saxon, 930 ; Greek, 1200, &c.

(5) The reception of this Creed may be shewn
A. D. 550. to have been in Gaul, as early as A. D. 550 ; Spain, 630 ; Germany, 787 ; England, 800 ; Italy, 880 ; Rome, 930.

From these considerations we trace the Creed to the middle of the sixth century, when it appears to have been well known, commented on, and treated with great respect ; and that more especially in the churches of Gaul.

2 The Internal Evidences are these :

(1) It was clearly written after the rise of the
Not before A. D. 370. Apollinarian heresy, for the Creed is full, clear, and

minute in obviating all the cavils of that heresy concerning the incarnation of Christ¹. This heresy arose about A.D. 360, and grew to a head about A.D. 370. Epiphanius marks the time when creeds began to be enlarged in opposition to Apollinarianism, viz. A.D. 373,² about which year Athanasius died.

(2) The Creed appears to have adopted several of St. Augustine's expressions and modes of reasoning. Not before A.D. 416. Now he wrote his books on the Trinity about A.D. 416. Especially this Creed contains the famous *Filioque*; and Augustine was the first who brought the doctrine of the Procession from the Son prominently forward; whence he has been charged by the Greeks with being the father of that doctrine. This would make it probable that the Creed was not written much before A.D. 420.

(3) It appears, however, to have been written before A.D. 451. before the rise of the Eutychians; for there is not a word plainly expressing the *two natures* of Christ, and excluding *one nature*; which critical terms are rarely or never omitted in the Creeds after the Eutychian times. Nay, though this Creed does in effect oppose this as well as other heresies, there are expressions in it which, it has been thought, might have been laid hold of by Eutyches in his favour, and therefore would not have been written after his heresy had arisen: e.g. 'One, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the manhood into God.' This might have been perverted to prove the Eutychian dogma, that Christ's manhood was converted into and absorbed in His Godhead. Again, 'As the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ.' The Eutychians might have argued from this clause, that, as body and soul make up the *one nature* of man, so God and man in Christ made *one nature* also.

¹ It will be remembered that the Apollinarians denied a human soul to Christ, and said that the Godhead supplied the place of the rational soul. See August. *Hæres.* 49. Tom. viii. p. 19.

² Epiphanius *Ancorat.* c. 121, ap. Waterland.

Hence it is concluded that this Creed was written before the Council of Chalcedon, where Eutyches was condemned, A. D. 451.

Before
A. D. 431. (4) It was probably before the spread of the Nestorian heresy. It is certain that this Creed does not condemn Nestorianism in the full, direct, and critical terms, which Catholics made use of against that heresy. There is nothing about the *Deipara* in it, or about *one Son* only in opposition to two Sons, or about *God* being *born*, or *suffering* and *dying*. But such terms ever occur in Creeds drawn up, or writings directed against Nestorianism. And though terms occur in it, which may be held to condemn both Eutychianism and Nestorianism, yet they are not stronger than were used by those who, before the rise of both these heresies, wrote against the Apollinarians, whose doctrine bore considerable resemblance in some points to that of Eutyches, and the maintainers of which often charged the Catholics with something very like the doctrine afterwards held by Nestorius. Hence, in the Apollinarian controversy, the fathers were often led to condemn, by anticipation, both Nestorius and Eutyches. If this reasoning be correct, the Athanasian Creed must have been written before the Council of Ephesus, where Nestorianism was condemned, A. D. 431.

Thus the internal evidence leads us to conclude that the Athanasian Creed was, in all probability, composed between A. D. 420 and A. D. 431.

As to the *place* where it was made, evidence tends to shew that it was *Gaul*.

(1) It seems to have been received first in Gaul. (2) It was held in great esteem by Gallican councils and bishops. (3) It was first admitted into the Gallican Psalter. (4) The oldest versions of it, commentaries on it, citations from it, and testimonies to it, are Gallican, or connected with Gaul. (5) The greatest number of the manuscripts of it, and those of greatest antiquity, are found in Gaul.

From such arguments as these it has been concluded, with the greatest probability, that this Creed was written in France, and at some time in the interval between A. D. 420 and 431.¹

The authorship of it then must be assigned to some person or persons who flourished at this period in the Church of Gaul.

Now Vincentius Lirinensis and Hilary of Arles both were Gallican divines, and both flourished at the required time.

Vincentius was a writer of great celebrity and judgment, and his works contained thoughts and expressions which bear a great similarity to the expressions in the Athanasian Creed. It is true his famous work, the *Commonitorium*, is assigned to the date 434, i. e. a few years later than the probable date of the Athanasian Creed. But there seems no reason why he should not have written the Creed before the *Commonitorium*.

On the other hand, it is argued by Dr. Waterland, that Hilary was a bishop, which Vincentius was not; and such a work appears much fitter for a bishop than for a private presbyter. He was made a bishop A. D. 429, which falls exactly within the limits assigned for the date of the Creed; and what more likely than that he should have set it forth when he entered on his diocese? He is spoken of as a man of great powers. His writings are said to have been small tracts, but extremely fine; and Honoratus of Marseilles, who wrote his life, says, that he wrote an excellent *Exposition of the Creed*; which is the proper title for the work in question, a work which was rarely called a *Creed* (*symbolum*) by the ancients. Again, he was a great admirer of St. Augustine (in all but his views of predestination), whence we may account for the similarity of the expressions in this Creed to the language of that father. The resemblance, which is traced to the language of Vincentius, may have resulted from the fact, that Hilary and Vincentius

¹ See Waterland, as above.

were not only contemporaries, but had been inmates about the same time, of the same monastery at Lerins ; that so Vincentius might borrow expressions from Hilary to whom he would be likely to look up with respect. Lastly, the style of this Creed answers well to what is told us of the style and character of Hilary.

To conclude, whether we assign the Athanasian Creed to Hilary or Vincentius, or to both or neither of them, it was pretty certainly the work of some Gallican writer in the beginning of the fifth century. It was very probably called *Athanasian*, because it clearly expressed the doctrines which Athanasius so ably defended ; and because when Arianism was rife in Gaul, as it was soon after the publication of this Creed, the Arians very probably called the Catholics Athanasians, and the Creed which especially and most fully expressed their doctrines, the *Athanasian Creed*¹.

II. The particular value of this Creed consists in this, that it guards the doctrine of the Trinity and of the Incarnation against the various heretical subtleties by which it has been explained away : and although it may be argued that most of these heresies were ancient, and therefore out of date, it is far from being true that they may never recur. Arianism, Sabellianism, Apollinarianism, against which it seems chiefly to have been directed, have all been revived in late times ; even Nestorian and Eutychian doctrines, which the Creed as it were anticipates and condemns, have been more or less approved in our days. And, although none of these errors were openly professed ; yet the loose way in which many modern writers on Theology often express themselves, requires to be restrained by something like the Creed in question, which, by its accurate language, is calculated to produce accuracy of thought.

¹ See Waterland's *History of the Athanasian Creed* ; *Works*, Vol. iv.
Vol. I. X

Even then, if some people may think the damnatory clauses, as they are called, unduly strong; yet the occurrence of one or two strong expressions should not so far weigh with us, as to induce us to wish the removal of this confession of our faith from the formularies of the Church. It is, in the main, unquestionably true, that he who, having the means of learning the truth of Christ, shall yet reject and disbelieve it, shall on that account be condemned. It is probable, that the damnatory clauses in the Creed of Athanasius mean no more than the words of our Lord, 'He that believeth not shall be damned' (Mark xvi. 16). What allowance is to be made for involuntary ignorance, prejudice, or other infirmities, is one of those secret things which belong only to the Lord our God; concerning which we may hope, but cannot pronounce. The Gospel declares, that unbelief in the truth shall be a cause of condemnation; and the Church is therefore justified in saying the same. The extreme earnestness and, as to some it seems, harshness, with which the Creed expresses it, resulted from the imminent danger, at the time it was composed, from the most noxious heresy, and the need there was to hedge round the faith of the Church, as it were, with thorns and briers. If we think such language unnecessarily severe, still we must remember that nothing human is free from some mark of human infirmity, and should be slow to doubt the value of a Catholic exposition of the Faith, because one or two expressions seem a little unsuited to modern phraseology.

The meaning and importance of the different clauses will be best appreciated by observing, what errors they respectively opposed. Thus, let us begin with ver. 4: 'Neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the Substance.' The Patripassians and Sabellians confounded the Persons; the Arians divided the Substance of the Godhead. After this, the next 14 verses, down to 'yet not three Lords, but one Lord,' seem principally designed to oppose the Arian heresy, which denied the homo-

ousion. Accordingly they declare that, in the Holy Trinity there are *Three*, with a distinction of Person, but with an Unity of Substance or Essence; so that, though it is lawful to say that the Father, Son and Spirit, are distinct Persons, and that each Person is Lord, God, Almighty, uncreated, and incomprehensible; yet it is not lawful to say that there are three Gods, three Lords, three Almighties, three Uncreated, or three Incomprehensibles¹.

The 19th verse concludes this portion of the Creed, in the words, 'For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity to acknowledge every Person by Himself to be God and Lord; so are we forbidden by the Catholic Religion to say, There be three Gods or three Lords.' Now the former part of this clause has been supposed by some to speak so that we might infer from it, that any one Person in the Trinity, by Himself, would constitute the whole Godhead. This, however, is far from being the real or natural sense of the passage. The meaning is this: Each Person in the Trinity is essentially God. And we must not view God as we would a material being, as though the Godhead could be *divided* into three different parts, which three united together made up one whole; and so imagine that the Father alone was not God, but required to have the Son and the Spirit *added* to Him in order to make up the Godhead. No! The spiritual unity of the three Blessed Persons in the Trinity is far closer, more intimate, and more real than that unity by which parts make up a whole. Each by Himself, or considered alone, must be confessed to be God; and yet all make not up three gods, but are One in Essence, and therefore but One God.

The next four verses are opposed to those who confounded

¹ The original of the word 'incomprehensible' is 'immensus,' i. e. *ἀπειρος*, boundless, immeasurable, or omnipotent. See Waterland, *Hist. of Ath. Cr. Ch.* x.; *Works*, Vol. iv. p. 385.

the Persons of the Godhead, making the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, not only one God, but one Person. And they state the relations of the Son to the Father, and of the Holy Ghost to both of them.

The 23rd verse runs thus: 'So there is one Father, not three Fathers; One Son, not three Sons; One Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts.' It may be asked here, of what use is this clause? Did any heretics ever teach that there were three Fathers, or three Sons, or three Holy Ghosts? The answer is, those who asserted that there were three unoriginated principles (*τρεις ἀναρχοι*), were considered to teach virtually that there were three Fathers or three Sons, or three Holy Ghosts, or a Trinity of Trinities. Thus one of the Apostolical Canons is directed against presbyters, who should baptize 'in three unoriginated principles, or in three Sons, or in three Paracletes, or in three Holy Ghosts.' The Council of Bracara denounces those who shall say, 'as the Gnostics and Priscillianists, that there is a Trinity of Trinities.' And Pope Vigilius decrees that, if any 'baptize in one Person of the Trinity, or in two, or in three Fathers, or in three Sons, or in three Comforters,' he should be cast out of the Church¹.

The Creed from verse 27 treats of the Incarnation, and excludes the various heretical opinions on this subject.

Some denied that Christ was God, as the Ebionites, Arians, &c. Others denied that He was Man; as the Gnostics, the Apollinarians, and afterwards the Eutychians. Especially the Apollinarians denied that He was perfect man, having both a reasonable soul and human flesh besides His Godhead, ver. 30.

Again, the Apollinarians charged the Catholics with saying that Christ was two; since they assigned Him a human soul as well as a Divine Spirit. Therefore the Creed adds, that 'though He be God and Man, yet He is not two, but one

¹ Bingham, *E. A.* Bk. XI. ch. III. § 4.

Christ.' A clause which afterwards was suitable to oppose the Nestorians, who held that there were two *Persons* united in Christ, ver. 32.

Once more, the Apollinarians made the Godhead of Christ act the part of a soul to His Manhood; which was virtually converting the Godhead into flesh¹. The true doctrine was, not that God was changed into man, but that the Word of God took human nature into union with His Godhead. Therefore the Creed says 'One, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the Manhood into God,' ver. 33.

Again, the Apollinarians made a 'confusion of substance' in Christ, for they confounded His Godhead and His Manhood; as the Eutychians did afterwards, inasmuch as they made His Godhead act the part of His human soul. Therefore says the Creed, 'One altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of Person,' *i. e.* by uniting both natures in one Person, ver. 34. And this is further explained, that, as in the ordinary man there are two different substances, body and soul, united in one; so in Christ two different natures, God and Man, are intimately united, yet not confounded together, ver. 35: 'As the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and Man is one Christ.'

Thus the principal clauses of the Creed are drawn up to obviate the principal errors on the two chief doctrines of the Christian faith. If such errors had never arisen, the accurate language of the Creed would have been useless. But when dangers have been shewn to exist, opposition to them seems inevitably forced upon the Church. Peace is infinitely to be desired, but it is better to contend for the faith than to lose it.

¹ Contentiosissime affirmantes, Verbum carnem factum, hoc est, Verbi aliquid in carnem fuisse conversum atque mutatum.—Augustin. *Hæres.* 55.

THE THREE CREEDS IN THEIR ORIGINAL LANGUAGES.

1. *Symbolum Apostolorum.*

Πιστεύω εἰς τὸν Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, καὶ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν. τὸν συλληφθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, γεννηθέντα ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, παθόντα ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, σταυρωθέντα, θανόντα, καὶ ταφέντα, κατελθόντα εἰς ᾄδου, τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστάντα ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καθεζόμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς παντοδυνάμου, ἐκεῖθεν ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Πιστεύω εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἁγίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἁγίων κοινωνίαν, ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Ἀμήν.

2. *Symbolum Constantinopol.*

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἓνα Θεὸν, Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων. Καὶ εἰς ἓνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων· φῶς ἐκ φωτός, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ. γεννηθέντα, οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί· δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν, κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα· σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ταφέντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς· καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρὸς. καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ Κύριον, καὶ τὸ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύομενον, τὸ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον, καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν· Εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν· ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν βαπτίσμα εἰς ἄφεσιν

ἁμαρτιῶν, προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. Ἀμήν.

3. *Fides Sancti Athanasii.*

1 Quicumque vult salvus esse, ante omnia opus est ut teneat Catholicam Fidem.

2 Quam nisi quisque integram inviolatamque servaverit, absque dubio in æternum peribit.

3 Fides autem Catholica hæc est, ut unum Deum in Trinitate, et Trinitatem in Unitate veneremur :

4 Neque confundentes Personas, neque Substantiam separantes.

5 Alia est enim Persona Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritus Sancti.

6 Sed Patris, et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, una est Divinitas, æqualis Gloria, coæterna Majestas.

7 Qualis Pater, talis Filius, talis et Spiritus Sanctus.

8 Increatus Pater, increatus Filius, increatus et Spiritus Sanctus.

9 Immensus Pater, immensus Filius, immensus et Spiritus Sanctus.

10 Æternus Pater, æternus Filius, æternus et Spiritus Sanctus.

11 Et tamen non tres æterni, sed unus æternus.

12 Sicut non tres increati, nec tres immensi, sed unus increatus, et unus immensus.

13 Similiter, Omnipotens Pater, Omnipotens Filius, Omnipotens et Spiritus Sanctus.

14 Et tamen non tres Omnipotentes, sed unus Omnipotens.

15 Ita Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus et Spiritus Sanctus.

16 Et tamen non tres Dii, sed unus est Deus.

17 Ita Dominus Pater, Dominus Filius, Dominus et Spiritus Sanctus.

18 Et tamen non tres Domini, sed unus est Dominus.

19 Quia sicut singillatim unamquamque Personam et Deum et Dominum confiteri Christiana veritate compellimur; ita tres Deos aut Dominos dicere Catholica religione prohibemur.

20 Pater a nullo est factus, nec creatus, nec genitus.

21 Filius a Patre solo est, non factus, nec creatus, sed genitus.

22 Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio, non factus, nec creatus, nec genitus est, sed procedens.

23 Unus ergo Pater, non tres Patres; unus Filius, non tres Filii; unus Spiritus Sanctus, non tres Spiritus Sancti

24 Et in hac Tinitate nihil prius aut posterius, nihil majus aut minus, sed totæ tres Personæ coæternæ sibi sunt, et coæquales.

25 Ita ut per omnia, sicut jam supra dictum est, et Unitas in Trinitate, et Trinitas in Unitate veneranda sit.

26 Qui vult ergo salvus esse, ita de Trinitate sentiat.

27 Sed necessarium est ad æternam Salutem, ut Incarnationem quoque Domini nostri Jesu Christo fideliter credat.

28 Est ergo Fides recta, ut credamus et confiteamur, quia Dominus noster Jesus Christus, Dei Filius, Deus pariter et Homo est.

29 Deus est ex substantia Patris ante sæcula genitus: Homo, ex substantia Matris in sæculo natus.

30 Perfectus Deus, perfectus Homo ex anima rationali et humana carne subsistens.

31 Æqualis Patri secundum Divinitatem: minor Patre secundum Humanitatem.

32 Qui licet Deus sit et Homo, non duo tamen, sed unus est Christus.

33 Unus autem, non conversione Divinitatis in carnem, sed assumptione Humanitatis in Deum.

34 Unus omnino, non confusione Substantiæ, sed unitate Personæ.

35 Nam sicut anima rationalis et caro unus est Homo ;
ita Deus et Homo unus est Christus.

36 Qui passus est pro salute nostra, descendit ad inferos,
tertia die resurrexit a mortuis.

37 Adscendit ad cœlos, sedet ad dexteram Patris ; inde
venturus judicare vivos et mortuos.

38 Ad cujus adventum omnes homines resurgere habent
cum corporibus suis, et reddituri sunt de factis propriis
rationem.

39 Et qui bona egerunt, ibunt in vitam æternam, qui
vero mala, in ignem æternam.

40 Hæc est Fides Catholica, quam nisi quisque fideliter,
firmiterque crediderit, salvus esse non poterit.

ARTICLE IX.

Of Original, or Birth-sin.

ORIGINAL Sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk); but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the Spirit; and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek *φρόνημα σαρκός*, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire of the flesh, is not subject to the law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized; yet the Apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.

De Peccato Originali.

PECCATUM originale non est (ut fabulantur Pelagiani) in imitatione Adami situm, sed est vitium, et depravatio naturæ, cujuslibet hominis, ex Adamo naturaliter propagati: qua fit, ut ab originali justitia quam longissime distet, ad malum sua natura propendeat, et caro semper adversus spiritum concupiscat, unde in unoquoque nascentium, iram Dei, atque damnationem meretur. Manet etiam in renatis hæc naturæ depravatio. Qua fit, ut affectus carnis, Græce *φρόνημα σαρκός* (quod alii sapientiam, alii sensum, alii affectum, alii studium carnis interpretantur) legi Dei non subjiciatur et quanquam renatis et credentibus, nulla propter Christum est condemnatio, peccati tamen in sese rationem habere concupiscentiam, fatetur Apostolus.

SECTION I.

HISTORY.

THE origin of evil in the world has from very early times been a subject of speculation among philosophers and divines. What the Jewish opinions on the question may have been, is not easy to decide. The rite of circumcision, as administered to infants, may have been understood, as shewing

that infants were born in sin, and had need of the circumcision of the Spirit, to make them partakers of the promises of God. The custom among the Jews to baptize (as well as to circumcise) all proselytes, whether men, women or children, may seem to indicate that they looked on all, even from their birth, as naturally unclean, and needing a laver or cleansing, before admission to the privileges of their Church¹.

That the early fathers of the Christian Church held the universality of human corruption, there can be but little question. A history of infant baptism is also a history of the doctrine of original sin, baptism being for the remission of sin². If there were no original sin, infants could have no need to be baptized. Hence Wall, in his *History of Baptism*, has brought together, with great labour and fidelity, passages from the earliest writers, shewing their belief in the original infection of our nature from Adam. It is not to be expected that the fathers would speak as clearly on this point before as after the rise of Pelagianism. But a fair inspection of the passages thus cited will convince us that the doctrine was held, almost as clearly as is expressed in our own Article, from the very earliest times of the Church³.

For examples of the language of the fathers we may take the following passages: 'Besides the evil,' says Tertullian⁴, 'which the soul contracts from the intervention of the wicked spirit, there is an antecedent, and, in a certain sense, natural evil arising from its corrupt origin. For, as we have already observed, the corruption of our nature is another nature, having

¹ See the account of this custom at length in Wall's *History of Infant Baptism*. Introd.

² Mark i. 4. Acts xxii. 16.

³ See especially the quotations from Clem. Rom. Vol. i. pp. 47, 48; Justin Martyr, pp. 64, 68; Tertullian, p. 95; Origen, p. 121; Cyprian, p. 182. Compare Bishop Kaye's *Justin Martyr*, p. 75; *Tertullian*, p. 325.

⁴ *Malum igitur animæ, præter quod ex obventu spiritus nequam superstruitur, ex originis vitio antecedit, naturale quodammodo.* Nam, ut

its proper god and father, namely, the author of that corruption.'

Cyprian, and the council of sixty-six bishops with him (A. D. 253), in their epistle to Fidus, use the following words: 'If then the greatest offenders, and they that have grievously sinned against God before, have, when they afterwards come to believe, forgiveness of sins, and no person is kept off from baptism and this grace; how much less reason is there to refuse an infant, who, being newly born, has no sin, save that being descended from Adam according to the flesh, he has from his very birth contracted the contagion of the death anciently threatened: who comes for this reason more easily to receive forgiveness of sins, because they are not his own but others' sins that are forgiven him¹?'

On this, however, as on other articles of faith, there arose heresies from very early times. In the second century, about A. D. 180, Florinus, a presbyter of the Church of Rome, taught that God was the author of evil. This man had been a friend of Irenæus, and a disciple of Polycarp's. A fragment of a letter from Irenæus addressed to him, in which Irenæus combats his peculiar error, is preserved by Eusebius². The Marcionites had, before this, taught the doctrine of two principles,

diximus, naturæ corruptio alia natura est, habens suum Deum et patrem, ipsum scilicet corruptionis auctorem.—*De Anima*, c. 41; Bp. Kaye, p. 326. See also cap. 40: Ita omnis anima eousque in Adam censetur, donec in Christo recenseatur; tamdiu immunda, quamdiu recenseatur.

¹ Porro autem si etiam gravissimis delictoribus, et in Deum multum ante peccantibus, cum postea crediderint, remissa peccatorum datur, et a baptismo atque a gratia nemo prohibetur; quanto magis prohiberi non debet infans, qui recens natus nihil peccavit, nisi quod, secundum Adam carnaliter natus, contagium mortis antiquæ prima nativitate contraxit? qui ad remissam peccatorum accipiendam hoc ipso facilius accedit, quod illi remittuntur non propria, sed aliena peccata.—Cyprian. *Epist.* 64 *ad Fidum*. Wall, Vol. i. p. 128.

² Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 20. See Heylin, *Historia Quinquarticularis*, ch. i.; *Heaven's Irenæus*, p. 24; also Augustin. *Hæres.* 66, Tom. viii. p. 21.

the one of good and the other of evil ; and it has been thought probable, that it was in opposition to this, that Florinus fell into the opposite heresy, and that, in maintaining the sole sovereignty of God, he was led to make Him the author of sin¹.

The Gnostic heretics in general attributed the origin of sin to matter, which they considered as essentially evil. Colorbasus, we are told², and Priscillian, held that men's actions were influenced by the stars³. The Manichees, like the Marcionites before them, but more systematically, taught the eternal existence of two opposite and antagonistic principles, to the one of which they attributed the origin of evil⁴.

The great Origen, though using freely those passages of Scripture, which speak of man's natural corruption, and of his being born in sin⁵; yet, from his peculiar theory of the pre-existence of human souls, could scarcely hold that man's sinfulness was derived from the first sin of Adam. His theory was, that all souls of men have existed in a former state and are confined in bodies, and placed in circumstances according to their conduct in that former state ; and that the bodies which they now have are more or less gross according to the qualities of their former crimes⁶.

¹ Lardner's *Hist. of Heretics*, ch. x. § x. ; Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, ch. vii.

² Augustin. *De Hæres.* 15.

³ Augustin. *De Hæres.* 70: Adstruunt etiam fatalibus stellis homines colligatos.

⁴ See Mosheim, Cent. iii. pt. ii. ch. v. The Manichees are said to have taught that 'sin was a substance.' And Saturninus and the Manichees are said to have taught that sin was in man 'a natura, non a culpa,' which accounts for the language of the fathers against them, e.g. Theodoret, *Dial.* i. : ἡ ἀμαρτία οὐκ ἔστι τῆς φύσεως ἀλλὰ τῆς κακῆς προαιρέσεως. See Suicer, i. p. 208. The Manichees did not consider sin to lie in a depravation of the whole natural actions and thoughts of man, but in an evil constitution of a portion of his nature, which they traced to that principle, whom they considered as the creator of all the evil in the universe.

⁵ See, for example, the passage quoted by Wall, Vol. i. p. 121.

⁶ See Dupin, *Eccles. Hist.* Cent. iii. Art. Origen. See also a good,

In the beginning of the fifth century a very important heresy sprang up, which called forth more decidedly the sentiments of the Church on this doctrine. Pelagius was a monk residing at Rome, but of British extraction, his name, in his own country, being probably Morgan. Coelestius, another monk, a native of Ireland, and Julianus, a bishop, were his chief allies. His heresy was spread abroad about A. D. 410, the year that Rome was taken by the Goths. Coelestius, having endeavoured to take priest's orders at Carthage, was accused by Paulinus, a deacon of that Church, of holding several false opinions. About the same time, St. Augustine wrote his first treatise against the same errors. Pelagius had retired into Palestine, whither Augustine sent Orosius, a Spanish presbyter, to accuse him before a Synod of bishops at Jerusalem. Here, and at Diospolis, he was acquitted without censure. But in the year 416, two Councils, one at Carthage and another at Milevis, condemned the Pelagian opinions. Innocent, Bishop of Rome, was written to by the Councils, and agreed in their decision. But, in the year 417, he was succeeded by Zosimus,

though popular, account of Origen's opinions in the *Biography of the Early Church*, by the Rev. R. W. Evans.

Origen has very generally been charged with semi-Pelagianism, and with being the forerunner of the Pelagian heretics. It is very difficult to judge clearly and impartially about his opinions. A variety of causes tend to obscure them. It is, however, certain that at times he speaks most clearly of all men being born in sin, and needing purification. For example, Augustine could not speak more plainly than the following:—

Quod si placet audire quid etiam alii sancti de ista nativitate senserint, audi David dicentem: *In iniquitatibus, inquit, conceptus sum et in peccatis peperit me mater mea*: ostendens quod quæcumque anima in carne nascitur, iniquitatis et peccati sorde polluitur: et propterea dictum esse illud quod jam superius memoravimus, quia *nemo mundus a sorde, nec si unius dici sit vita ejus*. Addi his etiam potest, ut requiratur quid causæ sit, cum baptismus Ecclesiæ pro remissione peccatorum detur, secundum Ecclesiæ observantiam etiam parvulis baptismum dari; cum utique si nihil esset in parvulis quod ad remissionem deberet et indulgentiam pertinere, gratia baptismi superflua videretur.—Origen. *Homil. in Levitic. VIII. num. 3.*

who, gained over by the ambiguous confession of the Pelagians, and being himself a great admirer of Origen, pronounced in their favour. Augustine, however, with the African bishops, persevered in their opposition; and Zosimus, yielding to their representations, changed his mind, and condemned with great severity Pelagius and Coelestius. They were again finally condemned at the third general Council at Ephesus, which met to consider the tenets of Nestorius¹.

The doctrines charged against Coelestius at the Council of Carthage (A.D. 412) were—

‘That Adam was created mortal, and would have died, whether he had sinned or not. That the sin of Adam hurt only himself, and not all mankind. That Infants new born are in the same state that Adam was before his fall. That a man may be without sin, and keep God’s commandments if he will².’

Pelagius himself sent a Creed to Innocent, in which he avoids a clear statement concerning original sin, but distinctly asserts that, though we all need the help of God, we can all keep God’s laws if we will. The principal opponents of Pelagius were Augustine, Jerom, and Fulgentius³.

The controversies thus called forth were not soon allayed. A new sect soon arose from the former one, called Semi-Pelagians, whose opinions concerning original sin were not so objec-

¹ See the history of Pelagius and Pelagianism given by Wall, *Hist. of Infant Baptism*, Vol. i. ch. xix.; Mosheim, Cent. v. Part ii. ch. v. Also the History of Pelagianism given in the Preface to the tenth volume of the Benedictine Edition of St. Augustine’s works.

² Wall, Vol. i. p. 357.

³ The Pelagians endeavoured to prove that some of the ancient fathers, especially of the Greek Church, used their language, and denied the existence of sin in infants. Augustine, in his treatise *contra Julianum*, shews, in opposition to that heretic, that St. Chrysostom (whom Julian had cited in favour of Pelagianism) had in reality plainly expressed the doctrine of original sin.—Aug. *contra Julianum*, Lib. i. cap. vi. Vol. x. p. 509; Wall, Vol. i. p. 416.

tionable as those of Pelagius, but who ascribed far too much to the unassisted strength of the human will¹.

The sentiments of Pelagius found considerable favour in his native island of Britain, and caused many and grievous troubles to the Church there. Germanus, bishop of Auxerre, and Lupus, bishop of Troyes, were sent over to Britain by the Gallican Church, to confute the growing heresy, and had great success, if we may credit ancient accounts, in opposing both the temporal and spiritual enemies of the Church². The famous Dewi, or St. David, was afterwards greatly distinguished for the zeal and ability with which he opposed the prevailing error, and aided in its overthrow. Especially at the Council of Llanddewi Brefi, in Cardiganshire, his eloquence and arguments are said to have availed to the silencing of his adversaries, and the establishing of his own celebrity. He was hereupon unanimously elected primate, the aged Dyvrig (Dubritius) resigning in his favour; and he afterwards called another Synod at Caerleon, where his exertions were rewarded by the extermination of the heresy³.

The schoolmen, in the middle ages, as might have been expected, debated much concerning the subject of original sin. *Original Righteousness* they seem to have considered something superadded to the original nature of man, not a part of that nature. According to Luther's statement of their opinions, it was 'an ornament added to man, as a wreath upon a maiden's hair is an ornament bestowed on her, and not a part of herself'. Original sin, therefore, was the loss or privation of original righteousness, and man was an object of God's displeasure, not as possessing what was offensive to God, but as wanting in that

¹ See below, under Article X.

² Bede, *Hist. Lib.* i. cap. xvii.—xxii.; Stillingfleet's *Orig. Britan.* ch. iv.; Collier's *Eccl. Hist.* Book i.

³ Gildas Cambrensis. Rees' *Welsh Saints*, p. 193; Usher, *Brit. Eccl. Antiq.* c. v. xiii.; Williams' *Antiq. of the Cymry*, pp. 134, 287.

⁴ Luther, *Op.* vi. p. 38, ap. Laurence, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 256.

which was pleasing to Him. The body indeed was infected by the fall, whether from the poison of the forbidden fruit, or from whatever cause; but the soul suffered, only as deprived of that which Adam possessed, the presence of God, and supernatural righteousness, and as having the *imputation of sin* derived from Adam¹. The infection of the body was indeed *fomes peccati*, a fuel which might be kindled into sin; but the soul contracted *guilt* from imputation of Adam's guilt, not sin from the inheritance of Adam's sin, though deprived of primitive righteousness, a quality dependent on the presence and indwelling of God. St. Augustine had doubted whether the soul as well as the body was derived from the parents, and so contracted sin from them. But the schoolmen, deciding that the soul came direct from God, of necessity were led to deny a direct derivation of sin to the soul, confining its pollution to the body, which then infects the soul; and so they made the defect of the soul to consist in an absence of good, rather than in a presence and dominion of evil².

In the Council of Trent there was much discussion of the doctrine of the fathers and schoolmen on this article; after which the following decrees were finally determined on: (1) That Adam by transgressing lost holiness and justice, incurred the wrath of God, death, thralldom to the devil, and was infected both in soul and body. (2) That Adam derived to his poste-

¹ See Laurence, Serm. III. p. 59, &c., and note 4 and 5, p. 256.

The fathers appear, almost with one consent, to have held, that original righteousness consisted both of natural innocence, and of the grace of God vouchsafed to Adam. The one was lost simultaneously with the other. Indeed the one could not exist without the other. Original righteousness, therefore, according to the primitive teaching, was not only defect of sin, but also the presence of God's Spirit. At the fall, God's Spirit was forfeited, and primeval innocence lost at the same time. See this proved, with his usual learning and clearness of reasoning, by Bp. Bull, *Works*, Vol. II. Disc. v. Oxf. 1827. Bp. Bull gives strong reasons for believing this to be both the universal belief of the primitive Church, and the doctrine of the sacred Scriptures themselves.

² Sarpi, Council of Trent, p. 163.

rity death of body, and sin of soul. (3) That sin, transmitted by generation, not by imitation, can be abolished by no remedy but the death of Christ, and that the merit of Christ is applied to children in baptism, as well as to adults. (4) That newly-born children ought to be baptized, as having contracted sin from Adam. (5) That by the grace of baptism the guilt of original sin is remitted, and that all is removed which hath the true and proper nature of sin. And though the concupiscence remaining is called by the Apostle sin; the Synod declared that it was not true and proper sin, but was so termed, because it ariseth from sin, and inclineth to it¹.

The point, on which these decrees differed from the Ninth Article of our Church, is in the entire cancelling of original sin in baptism. According to the Scholastic definition, that original sin consisted in the deprivation of original righteousness, the Council of Trent determined that in baptism the soul was restored pure into the state of innocency, though the punishments which follow sin be not removed. This all the fathers expounded by saying, that the perfection of Adam consisted in an infused quality, which adorned the soul, made it perfect and acceptable to God, and exempted the body from mortality. And God, for the merit of Christ, giveth unto those that are regenerated by baptism another quality called justifying grace, which, wiping out every blemish in the soul, maketh it pure as was that of

¹ Concupiscentiam Ecclesiam nunquam intellexisse peccatum appellari, quod vere et proprie in renatis peccatum sit, sed quia ex peccato est, et ad peccatum inclinat.—Concil. Trident. Sess. v. Sec. 5. See Anathemas in the fifth Session, Sarpi, p. 173.

A great dispute arose between the Dominicans and Franciscans, the latter insisting that the Virgin Mary should be declared free from the taint of original sin—the Dominicans maintaining the contrary opinion. (Sarpi, p. 168.) The Council in the end declared that it did not mean to comprehend the B. Virgin in the decree (p. 173). Augustine had before professed himself unwilling to discuss the question of the Virgin's sinfulness, or how far grace might have overcome sin in her, out of reverence to our Lord. (See Wall, *Infant Baptism*, Vol. i. p. 404.)

Adam; yea, in some it worketh greater effects than original righteousness, but only it worketh no effect on the body, whereby mortality and other natural defects are not removed¹.

The Lutherans in this respect differed materially from the fathers of the Council; especially in maintaining that concupiscence had the nature of sin, and that the infection, though not the imputation of sin, remained in the baptized and regenerate².

The second article of the Augsburg Confession, which is the principal confession of faith of the Lutheran divines, is evidently the source from which our own ninth Article was derived. Without defining the nature of original righteousness³, or the mode in which Adam lost it, it declares the doctrine, that every man born naturally from Adam is born in sin, without the faith and fear of God, and with concupiscence, which disease is truly sin and deserving of damnation, in all who are not born again by baptism and the Spirit⁴.

Calvin, speaking of original sin, says that ‘As the spiritual life of Adam consisted in union with his Maker, so alienation

¹ Sarpi, p. 166.

² Ideo sic respondemus; in baptismo tolli peccatum quod ad reatum seu imputationem attinet, sed manere morbum ipsum, &c.—Melancthon. *Loc. Theolog.* p. 122, ap. Laurence, p. 215.

³ The Saxon confession, however, clearly speaks of original righteousness as something beyond mere innocency, calling it—in ipsa natura hominum lux, conversio voluntatis ad Deum. . . . ac fuisset homo templum Dei, &c.—*Sylloge Confessionum*, p. 246.

⁴ II. *De Peccato Originis*.

Item docent, quod post lapsum Adæ omnes homines, secundum naturam propagati, nascantur cum peccato, hoc est sine metu Dei, sine fiducia erga Deum, et cum concupiscentia, quodque hic morbus, seu vitium originis vere sit peccatum, damnans et afferens nunc quoque æternam mortem his qui non renascuntur per baptismum et Spiritum Sanctum.

Damnans Pelagianos, et alios, qui vitium originis negant esse peccatum, et ut extenuent gloriam meriti et beneficiorum Christi, disputant hominem propriis viribus rationis coram Deo justificari posse.—*Confession of Augsburg*. Compare the Saxon Confession, Art. *De Peccato Originis*.

from Him was the death of his soul. When the heavenly image was obliterated in him, he did not alone sustain the punishment, but involved all his posterity in it. The impurity of the parents is so transmitted to the children, that none are excepted; and that not by imitation, but by propagation.'... 'Original sin appears to be an hereditary depravity and corruption of our nature, diffused through all parts of the soul, which first makes men subject to God's wrath, and then brings forth works in us, which Scripture calls the works of the flesh.'... 'His destruction is to be ascribed only to man, as he obtained uprightness from God's mercy, and by his own folly fell into vanity.'... 'His sin did not spring from nature, but was an adventitious quality which happened to man, rather than a substantial propriety, which from the first was created in him¹.'

Among Calvinistic divines in general there has been a difference concerning the first introduction of sin, chiefly as to whether Adam fell freely or by predestination of God: the sublapsarian Calvinists holding that Adam sinned of his own free will; the supralapsarians holding that God decreed that he should fall.

The chief point of difference between the two great parties which so long divided the Protestant Churches, the Calvinists and Arminians, was on the *extent* of the vitiation of our nature by the fall. The Calvinists taught that the corruption of man was so great that no spark of moral goodness was left in him; that he was utterly and totally bad and depraved; that, however amiable he might be in regard to his fellow-men, yet, as regards God and godliness, there was no relic of what he once was, any more than in lost spirits and damned souls. The Arminians rejected this strong view of the subject, and, admitting the great corruption of man's heart and intellect, still maintained that some remains of his original condition might

¹ Calvin, *Inst.* Lib. II. cap. 1, 5, 6, 8—11.

be traced in him ; that his mind and will were indeed depraved and incapable of making any independent effort towards true godliness ; but that he still differed materially from evil spirits or the spirits of the damned, having a natural conscience, and an appreciation of what is good and of good report.

The Calvinists have generally insisted much on the imputation of Adam's sin to all his posterity as the true meaning of original sin, though admitting that such imputation was accompanied with actual depravity in the heart of each individual¹. Calvin himself seems rather to have held, that all men were liable to condemnation, because of their own sinfulness derived from Adam, not because of the imputation of Adam's sin².

At the time of the Reformation, the Anabaptists appear to have adopted Pelagian opinions. The Article on Original Sin, in the first draught of it as set forth in 1552, begins thus : 'Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, as the Pelagians do vainly talk, which also the Anabaptists do now-a-days renew.' Their rejection of infant baptism was of a piece, and naturally connected, with their denial of original sin.

In later times, the Socinians held on this subject thoroughly Pelagian language, and generally denied the corruption of human nature and the need of grace to turn men to godliness.

As regards the Church of England, there have been many attempts, on the one hand, to shew that she used the language of the later Calvinists, on the other, to prove that she symbolized with the Arminians. The Articles were drawn up before the great Calvinistic controversy had arisen, and therefore do not use the terms of that controversy. It is pretty certain that,

¹ See, for example, Edwards, *On Original Sin*, Part iv. ch. iii.—an able and judicious exposition of the Calvinistic view of this doctrine.

² *Atque ideo infantes quoque ipsi, dum suam secum damnationem afferunt, non alieno, sed suo ipsorum vitio sunt obstricti.*—Calv. *Inst.* Lib. ii. cap. 1. Sect. 8 ; Laurence, *B. L.* Serm. iii. note 13, p. 273.

in this and some of the following Articles, the English Reformers symbolized with Melancthon and the Lutheran divines, whose very words in the Confession of Augsburgh, or the Wirtemberg Confession, are frequently adopted in the wording of the Articles¹.

There is nothing said in the Ninth Article on the imputation of Adam's guilt, though that was a favourite subject of scholastic discussion, nor of the question whether original righteousness meant merely primitive innocence, or consisted moreover in a preternatural gift, and in the indwelling and presence of God. The statements are quite general, sufficiently guarding the truth, that every man naturally engendered of Adam brings into the world a nature inclined to evil, and very far removed from the original righteousness of our first parents; that this sinfulness of his nature deserves the wrath of God; and that, although the condemnation due to it is remitted to all who believe and are baptized, still even in the regenerate the infection, shewing itself in the way of concupiscence, remains, and has of itself the nature of sin.

The homily 'On the Misery of Man,' composed probably by the same hand which drew the first draught of the Articles, breathes the same spirit. The homily on the Nativity, in the second book of homilies, drawn up some time later, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, may be referred to as expressing the doctrine of original sin in somewhat stronger language; the divines of Elizabeth's reign having been brought into more intimate connexion with the Calvinistic reformers, and sympathizing more with them than was the case with the divines of the reign of Edward VI.

¹ See Laurence, *B. L.* notes to Serm. II., especially notes 12 and 15.

SECTION II.
SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

IN considering the Scriptural proof of the doctrine of original sin here, it will be better to confine ourselves strictly to the statements of the Article, avoiding as much as possible those discussions which the Article itself avoids; neither entering into the distinctions of the schoolmen, nor the disputes of the Calvinists, but resting satisfied with the plain practical ground, which our own reformers thought broad and deep enough.

The Article then may be said to embrace the five following propositions:

I. Original sin is the fault and corruption of our nature, which infects all men.

II. It is not derived by imitation, but inherited by birth.

III. Its extent is such that by it man is very far (*quam longissime*) gone from original righteousness.

IV. It deserves God's wrath and condemnation.

V. Its infection is not entirely removed by baptism, but that infection remains even in the *renati*; and though there is no condemnation to them that believe and are baptized, yet still lust or concupiscence has the nature of sin.

I. That 'original sin is the fault and corruption of our nature, which infects all men,' might be inferred from our general knowledge of mankind, and of the evil tempers even of childhood, if we had no express revelation of it.

In the earliest part of the Scripture history the Almighty declared, that 'the imagination of man's heart was evil from his youth' (Gen. viii. 21). Job attributed man's weakness and sorrows to the fact, that what was clean could not be brought

from what was unclean (Job xiv. 4). David, acknowledging his own sin from his youth, confessed that he was 'shapen in iniquity, and that in sin did his mother conceive him' (Ps. li. 5). Solomon declared, that 'there was not a just man on earth that did good and sinned not' (Eccles. vii. 20). And Isaiah, in foretelling the sacrifice of Christ, gives as the reason for it, that 'All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way' (Liii. 6. See also Gen. vi. 5—12. Job xv. 16. Psalm xiv. 2, 3; lviii. 3; cvi. 6, &c. Prov. xxii. 15. Jer. xvii. 5, 9).

These and similar passages, even before the coming of the Gospel, sufficiently shewed that there was an evil coextensive with our race and coeval with our birth, from which none were exempt, and which went with us from the cradle to the grave.

There are many passages in the Gospels which shew that the same doctrine pervades them; as our Lord's declaration that 'there is none good but One, that is God' (Matt. xix. 17); His committing Himself to no man, 'for He knew what was in man' (John ii. 24, 25); His declaration that no one could enter into the Kingdom of God, 'except he were born again of water and of the Spirit' (John iii. 3, 5, 6); nay, His institution of baptism, which all, who would be saved, must receive, shewing there was an uncleanness of nature, which needed to be washed away by grace.

But, of course, the writings of the Apostles, as being the more doctrinal portions of Scripture, treat most systematically on the subject. The whole of the earlier part of the Epistle to the Romans, more especially, treats of the sinfulness of man, which needs the sacrifice of Christ. The Apostle shews, in the first chapter, that the *Gentiles*, notwithstanding the light of nature—the natural conscience which God had given them; and in the second chapter, that the *Jews*, although to them had been committed the oracles of God, had yet all been condemned by their own acts and by their own Law. In the

third chapter, he concludes that *all* are under sin (Rom. iii. 9), that 'all have sinned and come short of the glory of God' (Rom. iii. 23). In the fifth chapter he shews that, from the time of Adam, 'death had passed upon all men, for that all have sinned' (ver. 12). In the seventh chapter throughout, he describes the natural man moved by the dictates of conscience to approve what is good, and yet constrained by a law in his members—the law of sin and death working in him—to follow what is evil. He then considers the same natural man instructed by the revealed Law of God, consenting to the Law that it was good, and yet unable to fulfil it, because of the sin that dwelleth in him, and that binds him down to do what is base: so that he even represents the Law as bringing death rather than life, as shewing the good and the beautiful, as kindling some feelings of desire for better things, but still as giving no power to reach after them. And all this, which he so strikingly describes to us, he tells us results from this cause, viz. that in man, that is in his natural condition, there dwelleth no good. 'I know that in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing¹.' In the eighth chapter, he shews how this defect

¹ Rom. vii. 18: 'In my flesh,' of course means in my natural and carnal state, according to the common Pauline antithesis of the flesh and the spirit. No doubt many persons have thought that the Apostle in this chapter is speaking of his own struggles against sin still dwelling in him, when under the dominion of grace. But it has always appeared to me that the whole thread of the Apostle's argument is broken, and the whole force of his reasoning destroyed by this hypothesis. The fact that he uses the first person singular need not puzzle us for a moment. It is his common habit to speak in the first person, when he means to represent himself as the type of others, of the world at large, or of others situated like himself. One sentence in the chapter, if it stood alone, would be enough to prove that the Apostle is not describing the state and conflict of a regenerate Christian. It is in v. 14: 'I am carnal, sold under sin.' The redeemed Christian, 'bought with a price,' and delivered 'from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God,' can never truly be represented as still 'sold under sin.' Christ has made him free, 'and he is free indeed.'

of our nature is remedied ; that whereas man by himself could not please God—whereas the Law was too weak, owing to the infirmity of man's sinful nature ; yet God sent His Son to save and His Spirit to sanctify ; and so those, who are in the Spirit and no longer in the flesh, can fulfil the righteousness of the Law. But 'the *carnal* mind is not subject to the law of God,' and 'they who are in the flesh' (*i. e.* in a state of nature, and not under grace) 'cannot please God,' Rom. viii. 8.¹ Just similar is St. Paul's language in his other Epistles ; see, for example, Eph. iv. 22, where he speaks of 'the old man, which is corrupt according to deceitful lusts ;' Eph. ii. 1, and Col. ii. 13, where he speaks of men, before their conversion and baptism, as having been 'dead in trespasses and sins ;' Eph. ii. 3, where he speaks of both Jews and Gentiles as 'by nature children of wrath ;' Gal. iii. 22, where he says that 'the Scripture hath concluded all under sin.'

We can scarcely need fuller proof that the Scriptures describe all men naturally born into the world as subject to the disease of sin.

II. We have next to prove that 'Original sin is not derived from imitation, but inherited by birth.'

In the third chapter of Genesis we have an account of the fall of Adam, and the consequent curse upon him, and the ground which he was to till.

Now the old Testament speaks of the impossibility of 'bringing a clean thing out of an unclean' (Job xiv. 4), and asks, 'What is man, that he should be clean ? Or he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous ?' (Job xv. 14).

¹ We must take care that by the expression, 'the flesh,' in Rom. vii. viii., we do not suppose the Apostle to mean the body, the material part of our being. This would be the Manichean error. It is not the body only, but the whole man, that the Scriptures speak of, as infected with sin. Compare John iii. 6. Gal. v. 19, 20. 1 Cor. iii. 3, 4.

The Psalmist, as we have seen, traces his own corruption to the fact that he was 'shapen in iniquity, and conceived in sin' (Ps. li. 5). Such expressions imply, that the sinfulness of parents passed to their children; and the universal taint, which we have already seen to be existing, is traced to an inheritance derived from father to son.

Such we cannot doubt is the meaning of our Lord, 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh' (John iii. 8). He was teaching Nicodemus the need which every one had to be born again, before he could see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus marvelled that a man should be born again. Our Lord explains that a spiritual birth was needed. And why? Because 'that which was born of the flesh is flesh.' The flesh signifies the natural, carnal, unholy state of man, as contrasted with the holy, spiritual state of the redeemed and regenerate. Now our Lord declared that every man had need of a new birth, because 'that which was born of the flesh was flesh.' Man inherited by birth the flesh—a fleshly, an unspiritual, an unholy nature; therefore he needed a new birth, a birth of the Spirit, which should make him spiritual, even as his former birth of the flesh had made him carnal. This surely sufficiently demonstrates that every man by nature was in a state of defect, and *that*, because he *inherited* defect *by birth*. He was born of parents who were carnal, and therefore he was carnal himself.

Accordingly St. Paul treats it as a well-known truth, that 'in Adam all die' (1 Cor. xv. 22). And in the Epistle to the Romans (~~v.~~ 12) he tells us, that 'by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned;' that 'through the offence of one many are dead' (ver. 15); that 'by one man's offence death reigned' (ver. 17); that 'by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation' (ver. 18); that 'by one man's disobedience many were made sinners.' (ver. 19).

It is true that the words thus cited might, if they stood

alone, bear the Pelagian interpretation, that Adam brought in sin by bringing in the first example of sin, and that his children sinned after him, by imitation of him, not because they derived a sinful nature from him; and so judgment passed upon all men, 'because all had sinned,' their own personal sins having caused their condemnation. But St. Paul expressly guards against such an interpretation by saying (ver. 14) that 'death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the *similitude* of Adam's transgression.' Death was the penalty which all had paid, even before the Law of Moses came to give more fully the knowledge of sin; and it had reigned not only in those whose presumptuous wickedness resembled the sin of Adam, but even in those who had not sinned after that similitude, in infants and idiots, and such as only inherited the nature, without following the example of Adam. This doctrine corresponds with the doctrine of our Lord, 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh.'

Accordingly the Apostle, when speaking of human nature in general, calls it 'sinful flesh' (Rom. viii. 3). Our Lord took our nature, such as it was derived from Adam, only He was 'without sin;' but because He took that nature, which was then universally corrupted, therefore St. Paul says, 'He was sent in the likeness of sinful flesh.' And with this doctrine entirely corresponds all that the Apostles write of the corruption of men by nature, and of the change or new birth necessary for every man who is in Christ; *e. g.* 'The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God' (1 Cor. ii. 15). 'I know that in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing' (Rom. vii. 18). 'They that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh' (Rom. viii. 5). 'The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God' (Rom. viii. 7, 8). 'The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh' (Gal. v. 17). Again, 'If any

man be in Christ he is a new creature' (2 Cor. v. 17). And the sinfulness of our natural state is called 'the old man,' and Christians are said to have 'put off the old man which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, and to have put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness' (Eph. iv. 22—24).

Now all this language appears to prove, that sin is a corruption and disease, affecting not only individuals, but the whole of human nature, so that whosoever inherits human nature inherits it so diseased. It is 'the flesh,' a nature debased and defiled; and whatever is born of the flesh, is flesh also. Adam, we find from the second chapter of Genesis, received from God a nature free from sin, and so not subject to shame. But he defiled it with sin, and it became at once subject to shame, and then subject to death. Accordingly, when he handed down that nature to his posterity, he could not hand it down pure as he had received it; he of necessity gave it to them, as he had himself made it, stained with sin, liable to shame, having the seeds of mortality, and subject to condemnation. This view of the subject explains and satisfies the language of Scripture; and no other view will. There have been popular illustrations of it, such as the comparison of the hereditary taints of disease and insanity, and other ways in which, in God's providence, the sins of the fathers are visited on the children. There have been philosophical discussions concerning the oneness of human nature, very needful and true, but unsuited to our limits here¹. We have already seen that there have been discussions as to whether the body only, or soul and body both, are derived from the parent, and so corrupted by his sins. Even this I have not fully entered into; though it is plain that Scripture speaks of *man*, not man's body only,

¹ See for example Hooker, Book v.; Wilberforce, *On the Incarnation*, chap. III.

as corrupted and condemned. 'In Adam all die.' From Adam 'all have sinned' (Rom. v. 12). Sin is a fault of the soul, and therefore plainly both body and soul are tainted with corruption.

III. We have next to consider the degree or extent of corruption thus naturally inherited by all men. Does original sin *totally* corrupt all men, so that there is no spark of natural goodness left? Or are there still relics of what man once was? still, though in wreck and ruin, some faint outlines of his original state of purity?

It has been contended that the words of our Article mean both of these sides of the alternative. Calvinists appealed to the words 'quam longissime,' in the Latin Article, as proving that man's defection from original righteousness was to the greatest extent possible, that is to say, total and entire¹. Their opponents argued that the convocation had translated these words by 'very far,' shewing that it was intended only to express a great and serious defection of our race from godliness, not a total destruction of moral sense and feeling.

The Scriptures evidently represent natural sinfulness as very great. The Almighty, speaking of the race before the flood, said that 'every imagination of his heart was only evil continually' (Gen. vi. 5). Yet this might apply only to that

¹ 'The Assembly of Divines,' in the year 1643, revised the first fifteen Articles with the view of making them speak more clearly the language of Calvinism. The Ninth, according to their revision, was to have stood thus:

'Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, as the Pelagians do vainly talk, but, *together with his first sin imputed*, it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is propagated from Adam; whereby man is *wholly deprived* of original righteousness,' &c. And ending with 'the Apostle doth confess that concupiscence and lust is *truly and properly* sin.'—Neale's *Hist. of Puritans*, Vol. v. Appendix, No. VII. London, Baynes, 1822. See also Laurence, *B. L.* p. 184.

generation, which had become so wicked as to call for signal judgment and destruction. But then after the flood, once more God declares that 'He will not again curse the ground for man's sake; *though*¹ the imagination of his heart be only evil from his youth,' Gen. viii. 21. This seems to be a more general proposition, indicating at least that man's heart might prove as evil after the flood as it had done before.

In the book of Job, Eliphaz the Temanite says, that God 'putteth no trust in His saints, and the heavens are not clean in His sight. How much more abominable and filthy is man which drinketh iniquity like water' (Job xv. 15). We must not always consider the words of Job's friends as of authority in matters of faith, since their judgment is afterwards condemned by God; and we must make allowance for the strong antithesis between *God* and *man*; yet still the passage shews that to a pious man like Job it was an argument likely to be admitted, that man was so filthy as to 'drink iniquity like water.'

In Jer. xvii. 9, we read that 'the heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked; who can know it?' It is truly argued, that 'desperately wicked' is an epithet stronger than the original warrants. The Hebrew word *שָׁדָיִם* signifies rather *dangerously sick*, and therefore *feeble*, and in a moral sense, *corrupted and depraved*. Yet still the passage shews that the heart of man, taken in the general, is so corrupted and depraved, as to be eminently deceitful and hard to know.

To these passages from the old Testament are added the words of St. Paul, 'I know that in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing,' Rom. vii. 12; and then again, 'The

¹ 'Though,' the translation of the margin of the English Version, probably expresses the 'וְ' of this passage better than 'for.' The conjunction assigns the reason why God had cursed the earth, not why He would not curse it again.

carnal mind is enmity against God ; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be,' Rom. viii. 7.

Such language undoubtedly proves the very great corruption of the human heart, so that we cannot hesitate to say with our Church, that by nature 'man is very far gone from original righteousness.' He is described as 'dead in trespasses and sins,' and therefore we ought to have no hesitation in admitting that his corruption is such as to prevent him from making any efforts to recover himself and turn by his own strength to calling upon God. This is the practical part of the doctrine, and our Church goes no farther.

Those, who would push the matter to its greatest length, contend, that the passages above quoted shew that the image of God, in which man was created, was utterly taken from him at the fall ; that he thenceforth had no trace of resemblance to what he once was ; and, though they may not use language so strong, the natural conclusion from that which they do use is, that, in a moral point of view, there is no distinction between fallen humanity and evil spirits.

Those who differ with them argue that God's image was indeed defaced by sin, and so the effect and blessing of it lost. But that that image was quite gone, they consider disproved by the declaration, that 'whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed ; for in the image of God made He man' (Gen. ix. 6)—by St. Paul's statement, that the man 'is the image and glory of God' (1 Cor. xi. 7)—by St. James' reasoning, that it is inconsistent with the same mouth to bless God, and to 'curse men, which are made after the similitude of God' (James iii. 9). All these passages, they say, refer to men since the fall, and therefore prove that, whatever effect the fall may have had, it cannot have wholly obliterated the image of the Almighty.

They say farther, that when St. Paul says, that 'in him, that is in his flesh, dwelleth no good thing,' he yet adds, 'that

to will is present with him, but how to perform that which is good he finds not' (Rom. vii. 18); and that he all along represents man as approving of what is right, but unable to accomplish it—as honouring the law, but not fulfilling it—as even 'delighting in the law of God after the inward man,' but finding another law ruling in his members, 'which brings him into captivity to the law of sin' (Rom. vii. 22, 23). Hence, though man is captivated and subdued by sin, there must be some relic of his former state to make him see and admire what is good, though unable to follow it; and so, the Apostle speaks of all men as subject to the dictates of natural conscience (Rom. ii. 14, 15), and does not hesitate to reason with unregenerate heathens, of 'righteousness, temperance, and judgement to come' (Acts xxiv. 25).

These and like expressions in Scripture, it is thought, are inconsistent with the stronger language which some have used concerning human depravity, although there is fully enough to shew the universal and fearful corruption of our nature, and our utter inability of ourselves to become righteous.

IV. We come next to consider the statement which is made in the Article, that original sin 'in every person born into the world deserveth God's wrath and damnation.' Dr. Hey thinks that the word 'damnation' is not necessarily to be understood of condemnation to eternal death, but may be construed, according to the proper signification of the term, to mean merely condemnation of some kind or other. The language of the Article is undoubtedly guarded, and studiously avoids expressing anything which cannot be clearly proved from Scripture. It is possible, therefore, that this may have been its meaning. But in either sense of the word we shall probably find fully sufficient support for the doctrine expressed.

The language of St. Paul already quoted, 'In Adam all die' (1 Cor. xv. 22); 'By one man sin entered the world, and

death by sin ; and so death passed upon all men ; for that all have sinned' (Rom. v. 12), shew that the woe denounced upon Adam, as the effect of his own sin, passed from him to his posterity, as the effect of that sinfulness which they inherited from him. Accordingly, the same Apostle calls all men 'children of wrath' (Ephes. ii. 3), and that we may be sure that this is true, not only of adults who have sinned wilfully, but even of infants, who have only inherited a sinful nature, we find our Lord, when speaking of the importance of the souls of little children, and of the guardianship of angels over them, attributing the blessings of their condition to His having delivered them from their original state, which was that of those that are *lost*. 'For,' said He, 'the Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost' (Matt. xviii. 11). With this corresponds the before-cited passage of St. Paul: 'Death reigned from Adam unto Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression.'

We find therefore all men, even children, represented as 'lost,' as 'children of wrath,' as subject to, and under the reign of 'death.' And this is said to have been brought in by the sin of one man, even Adam, and to have 'passed upon all men ; for that all have sinned.'

We cannot fail to infer that, as Adam by sin became subject to wrath and death, so all men are subject to the same wrath and death, because, by having a nature in itself sinful, they are, even without the commission of actual sin, yet sinners before God, and esteemed as 'having sinned.'

The death which Adam brought in is clearly (in Rom. v. and 1 Cor. xv.) opposed to the life which Christ bestows. That life is spiritual, and we therefore reason that the death, which is antithetic to it, is spiritual too. The conclusion is, that every person born into the world has a sinful nature and a sinful heart, which, though it have not broken out in acts of sin, yet constitutes him a sinner, so that he may be said to

‘have sinned ;’ and that, on this account, he is liable to death, whether by death be meant death of the body, or death of the soul.

It appears to me that our Church takes this view of the subject, and so, follows closely on the teaching of St. Paul. She has said nothing concerning that hypothesis, which was current among the schoolmen, and in general has prevailed amongst the followers of St. Augustine, that Adam’s sin was *imputed* to his posterity, and that as Levi was esteemed to have paid tithes in Abraham, being ‘yet in the loins of his father’ (Heb. vii. 9, 10); so all men are esteemed to have sinned in Adam, and thus have his act of disobedience imputed to them¹. The hypothesis is ingenious as explaining the language of the Apostle, but seems scarcely to correspond with his assertion that ‘death passed upon all men, for that all *have* sinned².’ It may be said indeed that they are *esteemed* to have sinned. But the statement is simply that they ‘*have* sinned.’ And it is much easier to understand that a being of sinful disposition should be considered as having done that, to which his disposition inevitably leads him, and which he has only left undone for lack of opportunity, than it is to suppose that he should be *esteemed* to have committed an act, which was really committed by another, five thousand years before his birth. At all events, where our Church leaves it, let it rest here. He, that will add to it, has power to do so.

V. It remains only to shew that the infection of original

¹ See Edwards, *On Original Sin*, Part IV. chap. III. Bp. Burnet, in stating the objections to this doctrine, gives this among the rest: ‘It is no small prejudice against this opinion that it was so long before it first appeared in the Latin Church; that it was never received in the Greek; and that even the Western Church, though perhaps for some ignorant ages it received it, as it did everything else, very implicitly, yet has been very much divided, both about this, and many other opinions related to it, or arising out of it.’—Burnet on Art. IX.

² The marginal translation of ἐφ’ ᾧ, ‘in whom,’ would much favour this hypothesis. But it needs proof that ἐφ’ ᾧ will bear such a rendering.

sin is not (as the Council of Trent ruled it) wholly removed by baptism, but that it remains even in the *renati*; and, though there is no condemnation to them that believe and are baptized, yet the lust or concupiscence, which remains in all men, has the nature of sin.

1 Let us first remark that ‘There is no condemnation to them that believe and are baptized.’ This is plain from our Lord’s words in His commission to His Apostles: ‘He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved’ (Mark xvi. 16). It is not less plain from the language of St. Peter, who, when asked by his hearers, what they should do for salvation? replied, ‘Repent, and be baptized’¹ (Acts ii. 38).

The questions, which may arise concerning the baptism of young children, may properly be reserved for the Article which treats expressly of baptism. Here it is sufficient to observe, that our Church, though not admitting that all *taint* of original sin is done away in baptism, yet holds that its *condemnation* is remitted. ‘It is certain,’ she says, ‘by God’s word, that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved².’

2 But though we thus believe that the condemnation, which original sin deserves, is, for Christ’s sake, remitted to all that believe and are baptized, and, in the case of infants dying before the commission of actual sin, is remitted on baptism alone; still we hold that the infection of that sin remains even in the *renati*. The word *renati* occurs twice in the Latin Article, and in the English Article it is translated first ‘regenerated,’ and secondly ‘baptized.’ It will be seen hereafter, on what principles the Church identifies ‘baptized’ and ‘regenerated;’ it is sufficient for our purpose here to observe, that both ideas are embraced in the word used here.

¹ The same appears in express terms from Rom. viii. 1: “There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.” Compare Gal. iii. 27.

² Rubric at the end of the Baptismal Service.

Now that the baptized and regenerate Christian is not free from the infection of original corruption, but has to fight against it, as an enemy still striving to keep him down, and, if possible, to destroy him, appears from the following considerations.

St. James urges Christians not to be in a hurry to be teachers, and gives as a reason, that in many things all Christians offend: 'In many things we offend all' (James iii. 2). St. Paul, speaking of his own exertions in the service of the Church, says that it will not do for him, when working for others, to neglect himself, but on the contrary says he, 'I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection; lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway' (1 Cor. ix. 27). He bids the Galatians, 'If a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted' (Gal. vi. 1). To those who 'are risen with Christ,' and whom he bids to 'seek those things which are above,' he yet adds the warning to mortify their earthly members, (that is, the members or characteristics of their old man,) which he describes as 'fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence and covetousness:' and further bids them put off 'anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication, lying,' as being suitable only to the old man, which they had put off, and unfitted for the new man, which they had put on. (Col. i. 1, 5, 8, 9). St. Peter, addressing the Church as 'new-born babes' in Christ (1 Pet. ii. 2), yet exhorts them (ver. 11), 'As pilgrims and strangers to abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul.'

Now all these passages, which clearly concern baptized and regenerate Christians, prove this; that there is still left in them a liability to sin; that, without much care and anxiety, all will fall into sin; and that even under all circumstances, all do 'offend in many things.' Accordingly St. John says of those, whose 'fellowship is with the Father and with His Son

Jesus Christ,' that 'if they say, they have no sin, they deceive themselves, and the truth is not in them' (1 John i. 8). Can anything account for this universally applicable language except the fact, as stated by our Church, that the infection of original sin remains even in the regenerate or baptized?

3 Lastly, the Article asserts that 'concupiscence and lust hath the nature of sin.'

The Council of Trent admitted the existence of lust and concupiscence in the regenerate, and admitted that such concupiscence arose from original sin, and tended to actual sin, but denied that it was sin in itself. The English Church is here at issue with the fathers of the Council.

Her opinion on this point is defended by such passages as these: 'Let not sin reign in your mortal bodies, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof' (Rom. vi. 12), where the lusts of sin seem clearly to be spoken of as sinful. Again, Rom. vii. 7: 'I had not known sin but by the Law; for I had not known lust except the Law had said, Thou shalt not covet.' Here lust and sin seem to be identified. Again, in Matt. v. (especially vv. 28, 29) our Lord speaks of the desire of sin as being itself sin. And in the passage quoted in the Article (Gal. v. 17), St. Paul says that 'the flesh lusteth against the Spirit.' Now we can hardly understand how the lusts of the natural man should be opposed to the Spirit of God, and yet be sinless. We conclude therefore that 'lust and concupiscence hath of itself the nature of sin¹.'

¹ The connexion between *lust* and *sin* is very apparent in the Hebrew language, which derives many of its usages from its theology. Thus יָהָה signifies both *desire* and *wickedness*. In Arabic هوى is *Vasta cupiditas, Amor intensissimus*, from هوى to *desire*. So in Hebrew, יָהָה is (1) *desire*, as in Prov. x. 3, יַהֲדֹת רָשָׁעִים יָהָה, "He withholdeth the *desire* of the wicked." (2) *wickedness*, as Ps. v. 10, קִרְבָּם יַהֲדֹת, "Their inward part is *very wickedness*." Where the plural form gives intensity.

ARTICLE X.

Of Free Will.

THE condition of man, after the fall of Adam, is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works to faith, and calling upon God; wherefore we have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us¹, when we have that good will².

De Libero Arbitrio.

EA est hominis post lapsum Adæ conditio, ut sese naturalibus suis viribus et bonis operibus, ad fidem et invocationem Dei convertere ac præparare non possit. Quare absque gratia Dei (quæ per Christum est) præveniente, ut velimus, ad pietatis opera facienda, quæ Deo grata sunt et accepta, nihil valemus.

SECTION I.

HISTORY.

THE Article on Free Will naturally follows that concerning Original Sin, and much which was said on the latter subject may be applicable to the explication of the former.

¹ This is the reading of the copy of the Articles as set forth in 1571. In 1562 the words run 'working in us,' and such was the reading in 1552.

² The Article, as it stood in 1552, began with the words, 'We have no power.' The former part was prefixed in 1562 by Abp. Parker, having been taken from the Wirtemberg Confession, the words of which are:

Quod autem nonnulli affirmant homini post lapsum tantam animi integritatem relictam, ut possit sese, naturalibus suis viribus et bonis operibus, ad fidem et invocationem Dei convertere ac præparare, haud obscure pugnat cum Apostolica doctrina et cum vero Ecclesiæ Catholicæ consensu.

The latter part, which constituted the whole of the original Article, has adopted the language of St. Augustine:

Sine illo vel operante ut velimus, vel cooperante dum volumus, ad bonæ pietatis opera nihil valemus.—*De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio*, cap. 17. See Abp. Laurence, *B. L.* pp. 233, 325.

The sentiments of the Apostolical Fathers on Free Will are probably nowhere very distinctly expressed. Their writings are rather practical than controversial, and hence these topics are not very likely to be discussed in them. That they fully and plainly teach the weakness of man, and the necessity of Divine grace, cannot be questioned.

The opinions of Justin Martyr are more clearly and definitely put forth in his extant works than are those of the Apostolical Fathers. In answer to objections which the Jews urged against the scheme of Christian doctrine, viz. that according to it there was an inevitable necessity that Christ should suffer, and therefore a necessity and constraint laid upon the Jews to crucify Him; Justin denies that God's foreknowledge of wicked actions made Him the author of those actions. He puts no restraint upon men's wills, but foretells certain evil actions, not because He causes, but simply because He foresees them¹. In like manner, in the first Apology, which was addressed to heathens, he explains that our belief in the predictions of the Prophets does not oblige us to believe that things take place according to fate; for if men acted under a fatal necessity, one could not be praised, nor another blamed². And in the second Apology he maintains, in opposition to the Stoics, who believed in an inevitable fate (*καθ' εἰμαρμένης ἀνάγκην πάντα γίνεσθαι*), that it is the nature of all men to have a capacity for virtue and vice; for unless there were a power of turning to either, there could be nothing praiseworthy³. Yet, with such a belief in the freedom of human choice, Justin fully maintained the necessity of Divine grace, and the impossibility of attaining salvation without the light and aid of God's Spirit⁴.

¹ *Dial. cum Tryphone, Opera*, p. 290.

² *Apol. i. Opera*, pp. 62, 63.

³ *Apol. ii. Opera*, p. 35.

⁴ *E. g.* Ἐπὶ Θεὸν τὸν πάντα ποιήσαντα ἐλπίζειν δεῖ πάντας, καὶ παρ' ἐκεί-

In the earliest ages, the Gnostic and other heretics held, to a great extent, the doctrines of material fatalism. We have already seen that some of the Gnostics considered actions as influenced by the stars. We have seen also that Florinus taught that God was the Author of evil, and that Irenæus, who had formerly been his friend, wrote against him¹. Against such statements Irenæus constantly maintained human freedom, and denied that the will was a mere machine, acted on by good or evil principles, and itself passive under them. But the necessity of the grace of God's Holy Spirit he as strongly expressed, when occasion required².

The Marcionites maintained that the universe was governed by two independent principles, one of good, and the other of evil. This naturally led to the belief in a physical restraint on the will of the creature. Accordingly, Tertullian, in disputing against them, strenuously contends that freedom of the will was given to Adam³. From the same father we learn that Valentinus taught that man was created of three different kinds,—spiritual, animal, and terrestrial; the first sort as Seth, the second as Abel, the third as Cain; and that, as the distinction was from birth, it was consequently immutable. The first kind were destined to certain salvation, the last to certain perdition, the lot of the second was uncertain, depending on their greater

του μόνου σωτηρίαν καὶ βοήθειαν ζητεῖν· ἀλλὰ μὴ, ὡς λοιποὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, διὰ γένος ἢ πλούτου ἢ ἰσχύος ἢ σοφίας νομίζειν δύνασθαι σώζεσθαι.—Dial. c. Tryph. Opp. p. 257.

Concerning Justin Martyr's opinions on free will, consult Bp. Kaye's *Justin Martyr*, p. 75, ch. iii.; Faber's *Primitive Doctrine of Election*, Bk. I. ch. xi.

¹ See History of the Ninth Article.

² *E. g.* Sicut arida terra, si non percipiat humorem, non fructificat: sic et nos, aridum lignum existentes primum, nunquam fructificaremus vitam, sine suprema voluntaria pluvia.—*Adv. Hær.* III. 19.

Concerning the opinions of Irenæus on free will, see Faber as above, and Beaven's *Account of Irenæus*, ch. xi. p. 112.

³ Tertull. *adv. Marcion.* Lib. II. 8, 9, &c.

inclination on the one hand to the spiritual, on the other to the carnal¹.

The fathers, who were contemporary with these heretics, were naturally led, in disputing against them, to use strong language on the freedom of the will; so that it is no wonder if, after the rise of Pelagius, his followers were ready to quote some of the ancients in defence of their errors.

Origen was one of those who opposed the Marcionite and Valentinian heresies; and his peculiar system of theology specially led him to more than ordinarily strong assertions of the freedom of the will. He took up the Platonic notion of the pre-existence of souls. The state of all created beings he believed to be regulated by their former actions. All souls were created free. Every rational creature was made capable of good or of evil. Angels and devils were alike created capable of holiness or of wickedness. The devil and his ministers fell by abuse of freedom; the holy angels stood by a right use of it². Every reasoning being is capable of degenerating or of improvement, according as he follows or resists reason. Men have been placed in different positions in this world; but it is because of their conduct in a former existence. Jacob was beloved of God more than Esau, because in the former life he had lived more holily³. And as good or evil are *substantially* in none but the Holy Trinity, but all holiness is in creatures only as an *accident*, it follows that it is in us and in our own wills to be holy, or through sloth and negligence to decline from holiness to wickedness and perdition⁴. Holiness is attained or

¹ Tertullian, *De Anima*, c. 21—30. See Bishop Kaye's *Tertullian*, pp. 330, 522.

² *De Princip.* Lib. i. cap. 5.

³ Lib. ii. cap. 9, num. 7.

⁴ Et per hoc consequens est in nobis esse, atque in nostris motibus, ut vel beati vel sancti simus, vel per desidiam et negligentiam a beatitudine in malitiam et perditionem vergamus, in tantum ut nimius profectus (ut ita dixerim) malitiæ, si quis in tantum sui neglexerit, usque ad eum statum deveniat, ut ea quæ dicitur contraria virtus efficiatur.—Lib. i. cap. 5, num. 5.

lost much as music or mathematics. No man becomes a mathematician, or a musician, but by labour and study, and if he becomes idle and negligent he will forget what he has learnt, and cease to be skilful in his science or his art ; and so no man will be good who does not practise goodness, and, if he neglects self-discipline and is idle, he will soon lapse into sin and corruption¹. Such language assigns so much strength to man, and keeps out of sight so much the necessity of Divine grace, that it has been truly said, not to have been ‘without reason, that St. Hierome accuses him of having furnished the Pelagians with principles ;’ though yet in some places he speaks very advantageously of grace and of the assistance of God².

In later times, as we have seen already, Manes and his followers held that good or evil actions were produced by the good or the evil principle. They appear to have believed that men are acted on by these powers as an inanimate stock, which must passively submit to the impulses which move it³.

St. Augustine was himself originally a Manichee. In his earlier treatises he constantly directs his arguments against the Manichæan doctrines, as being those errors with which he was best acquainted, and which he dreaded most⁴.

After the rise of Pelagianism, and when his efforts were chiefly directed to the overthrow of that heresy, he speaks less frequently and clearly in favour of the original freedom of the will, and brings more prominently out those predestinarian opinions which are so well known in connexion with his name.

¹ Lib. i. cap. 4.

² Dupin, *Ecclesiastical Hist.* Cent. iii. Origen.

It seems as if Clement of Alexandria pressed the doctrine of free will to a very undue extent, though not so far nor so systematically as his great pupil Origen. See Bp. Kaye's *Clement of Alexandria*, ch. x. p. 429.

³ Beausobre, and apparently Lardner who quotes him, doubt whether the Manichees did believe the will to be so thoroughly enslaved. See Lardner, *Hist. of Manichees*, Sect. iv. 13. Vol. iii. p. 474.

⁴ For instance, see the treatise *De Libero Arbitrio*, *Opp.* Tom. i.

It would not, however, be true to say that he materially changed his opinions on that subject; for in some of his most decidedly Anti-Pelagian writings, and whilst most strongly maintaining the sovereignty of Divine grace, he unequivocally asserts the freedom of the human will, as a gift of God to be used and accounted for¹.

The tenets of the Pelagians on this subject are expressed in one of the charges urged against Coelestius in the Council of Carthage, 'That a man may be without sin, and keep the commandments of God if he will²;' or in the passage which Augustine cites from his work, 'Our victory proceeds not from the help of God, but from the freedom of will³.' The Semi-Pelagians, though they did not deny the necessity of grace, yet taught that preventing grace was not necessary to produce the beginnings of true repentance, that every one could by natural strength turn towards God, but that no one could advance and persevere without the assistance of the Spirit of God⁴.

In the ninth century, Goteschalco, a Saxon divine, broached

¹ For example, *De Spiritu et Litera*, § 52. Tom. x. p. 114.

Liberum ergo arbitrium evacuamus per gratiam? Absit, sed magis liberum arbitrium statuimus. Sicut enim lex per fidem, sic liberum arbitrium per gratiam non evacuatur sed statuitur. Neque enim lex impletur nisi libero arbitrio: sed per legem cognitio peccati, per fidem impetratio gratiæ contra peccatum, per gratiam sanatio animæ a vitio peccati, per animæ sanitatem libertas arbitrii, per liberum arbitrium justitiæ dilectio, per justitiæ dilectionem legis operatio. Ac per hoc, sicut lex non evacuatur, sed statuitur per fidem, quia fides impetrat gratiam, qua lex impleatur: ita liberum arbitrium non evacuatur per gratiam, sed statuitur, quia gratia sanat voluntatem, qua justitia libere diligatur.

² Wall, *Infant Baptism*, Vol. i. p. 357; Collier, *Eccl. Hist.* Book i., and the account of Pelagianism given under Article IX.

³ Victoriæ nostram non ex Dei esse adjutorio, sed ex libero arbitrio. —August. *De Gestis Pelagii*, Tom. x. p. 215.

⁴ Mosheim, *Eccl. Hist.* Cent. v. Part II. ch. v. § 26.

Vitalis held that 'God did work in us to will, by the Scriptures either read or heard by us; but that to consent to them or not consent, is so in our own power that, if we will, it may be done.'—August. *Epist. cvii. ad Vitalem*.

strong predestinarian doctrines, which, of course, more or less embraced the subject of the present Article; for, as he is said to have held that God eternally decreed some men to salvation and others to perdition, he must have held that the will was in a great degree subject to an inevitable necessity¹. The history of this controversy, however, more properly belongs to the seventeenth Article. The disputes on the doctrines of Goteschalc divided the writers of his day. He was defended by Ratramn, monk of Corbey, famous on more accounts than one, and condemned by Rabanus Maurus and Johannes Scotus Erigena.

In the 12th century flourished Peter, surnamed Lombardus or Lombard, Archbishop of Paris, who wrote a book called *Libri Sententiarum*, in which he compiled extracts from the fathers on different points of faith and doctrine, from which he was afterwards known as the *Magister Sententiarum*, or *Master of the Sentences*. His work became the text-book for future disputants, the storehouse for scholastic polemics, esteemed well nigh upon a par with Scripture itself.

The schoolmen, who followed him, and flourished chiefly in the thirteenth and fourteenth century, discussed to a great extent the questions concerning predestination and the freedom of the will. The most famous of these, as being heads of parties which prevailed long and extensively, and which were strongly opposed to each other, were Thomas Aquinas and John Duns Scotus. Thomas Aquinas was a Dominican Friar, of a philosophical spirit and great learning, and was known by the name of *Doctor Universalis*, or *Angelicus*. He was born in the castle of Rocea Sicca, in the kingdom of Naples, A.D. 1224, and died in 1274. His most famous work is his *Summa Theologiæ*. In philosophy he was a Realist; in Theology, a disciple of St. Augustine. Duns Scotus, born at Dunston in

¹ See Mosheim, Cent. ix. Part II. chap. iii.

Northumberland, about the period of the death of Aquinas, was a Franciscan. He attacked the system of Thomas Aquinas, and acquired the name of *Doctor Subtilis*. He strongly maintained the doctrine of the freedom of the will. Duns Scotus was the founder of the School called the *Scotists*, to which the Franciscan friars belonged. The followers of Thomas Aquinas were called *Thomists*, and to these belonged the Dominicans, who with the Franciscans divided between them the learning of the Christian world in the ages preceding the Reformation.

In reasoning on the subject of the human will, and the need of grace to produce holiness, the school-authors invented a mode of speaking, alluded to in our thirteenth Article, by which they endeavoured to reconcile some of the apparent difficulties of the question. They observed that Cornelius, before his baptism and a knowledge of the Gospel, had put up prayers and given alms, which are spoken of in Scripture as acceptable to God¹. They thought therefore that some degree of goodness was attributable to unassisted efforts on the part of man towards the attainment of holiness; and though they did not hold that such efforts did, of their own merit, deserve grace, yet they taught that in some degree they were such as to call down the grace of God upon them, it being not indeed obligatory on the justice of God to reward such efforts by giving His grace, but it being agreeable to His nature and goodness to bestow grace on those who make such efforts. Endeavours then, on the part of man, to attain to godliness were by the Schoolmen said to deserve grace *de congruo*, of congruity. But when once grace was given, then it made the recipient and the user of it actually meritorious, or enabled him to deserve at the hands of God not only farther grace, but even in the end everlasting life. All this of course was to be considered as

¹ Acts x. 4: "Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God."

depending on the Atonement of Christ; but whatever was presupposed, it remarkably tended to the exalting the power of the will and the strength of unassisted man¹.

We now come to the period of the Reformation. The doctrine of grace *de congruo* gave the greatest possible offence to Luther, and called forth much of his strongest language. For example, in his treatise on the *Bondage of the Will* he asserted that 'in his actings towards God, in things pertaining to salvation or damnation, man has no free will, but is the captive, the subject and the servant either of the will of God, or of the will of Satan².' Again, 'If we believe that God foreknows and predestinates every thing.....it follows that there can be no such thing as free will in man or angel, or any creature³.' These expressions are characteristic of the vehemence of Luther's temper when opposing what he considered a dangerous error, and are much stronger than the opinions subsequently expressed by him, and very different from the language of Melancthon and the confessions of the Lutheran Churches.

In the council of Trent the Lutheran opinions on this doctrine were set forth to be discussed. Much was said on both sides of the question. The Franciscans, as being followers of Scotus, spoke much for the absolute freedom of the will, and in favour of the doctrine of grace *de congruo*. The Dominicans, after St. Thomas Aquinas, repudiated the idea of congruous

¹ Laurence, *B. L.* Serm. iv. and the notes to that Sermon *passim*.

² Cæterum erga Deum, vel in rebus quæ pertinet ad salutem vel damnationem, non habet liberum arbitrium, sed captivus, subjectus et servus est vel voluntatis Dei, vel voluntatis Satanae.—*De Servo Arbitrio*, *Opp.* Tom. i. p. 432.

³ Si enim credimus verum esse, quod Deus præscit et præordinat omnia, tum neque falli neque impediri potest sua præscientia et prædestinatione, deinde nihil fieri nisi ipso volente, id quod ipsa ratio cogitur concedere, simul ipsa ratione teste, nullum potest esse liberum arbitrium in homine vel angelo, aut ulla creatura.—*Id.* p. 481.

merit, and maintained the inability of man to turn to good of his own will since the fall of Adam. The decrees were drawn up so as to displease either party as little as possible, but with a leaning to the Franciscan doctrines. Those were condemned, who said that ‘since the sin of Adam free will is lost,’ and that ‘bad as well as good works are done by the working of God.’ Yet at the same time those were anathematized, who said that ‘a man could be justified without grace,’ ‘that grace is given to live well with greater facility and to merit eternal life, as if free will could do it, though with more difficulty;’ and who said that ‘a man may believe, love, hope, or repent, without the prevention or assistance of the Holy Spirit¹.’

In the earlier days of the Reformation, the Lutherans generally held extreme language on the slavery of the will, and Melancthon himself used expressions which he afterwards withdrew. The more matured convictions of this great writer were sober and wise; and the Confession of Augsburgh, whilst affirming that the will of man ‘hath not the power to effect the righteousness of God without the Spirit of God²,’ yet declares, that ‘the cause of sin is the will of wicked beings, viz. the devil and ungodly men, which, when not aided by God, turns itself from God, as it is written, When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of himself³.’

The Calvinistic reformers do not hesitate to use the most extreme expressions on the inability of man to do anything but evil. ‘The mind of man,’ says Calvin, ‘is so wholly alienated

¹ Sarpi, pp. 134, 210; Heylyn, *Historia Quinquarticularis*, Part I. ch. iv.

² Non habet vim sine Spiritu Sancto efficiendæ justitiæ Dei, seu justitiæ spiritualis, quia animalis homo non percipit ea, quæ sunt Spiritus Dei.—Art. xviii.; *Sylloge*, p. 129.

³ Art. xix. De causa peccati docent, quod tametsi Deus creat et conservat naturam, tamen causa peccati est voluntas malorum, videlicet diaboli et impiorum, quæ non adjuvante Deo avertit se a Deo, sicut Christus ait Joh. viii., Cum loquitur mendacium, ex seipso loquitur.—*Syll.* p. 130.

from God that it can conceive, desire, and effect nothing but what is impious, perverted, foul, impure, and flagitious; the heart of sin is so steeped in venom, that it can breathe forth nothing but fetid corruption¹.

The followers of Calvin have, for the most part, used language similar to their leader. Whether Calvin allowed to Adam free will in Paradise, or believed that even his fall was predestinated, has been matter of dispute. Of the Calvinistic divines, those called Supralapsarians, held, as has been mentioned before, that God foreordained that Adam should sin, and therefore denied to him free will even in a state of innocence. The Sublapsarians held that he fell of his own will, and not by constraint or through the ordination of God.

Among the bodies of Christians who embraced the Calvinistic doctrines and discipline, some of the most considerable were the Churches of Holland and Belgium. The Belgic Confession, put forth in the year 1567, contains explicit declarations, that all things in the world must happen according to the absolute decree and ordination of God, though God was not to be called the author of sin, or to be blamed for its existence². Several divines of the Belgic Church had demurred at these doctrines; and at the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century, Jacob Van Harmin, commonly known as Arminius, a pastor of Amsterdam, broached the sentiments generally known by the name of Arminianism. He dying in 1609, and his followers being persecuted by the dominant party, they addressed, in 1610, a *Remonstrance* to the states of Holland, whence they were called *Remonstrants*. Their sentiments on

¹ Stet ergo nobis indubia ista veritas, quæ nullis machinamentis quate fieri potest, mentem hominis sic alienatam prorsus a Dei justitia, ut nihil non impium, contortum, fœdum, impurum, flagitiosum concipiat, concupiscat, moliatur: cor peccati veneno ita penitus delibutum, ut nihil quam corruptum foetorem efflare queat.—Calv. *Institut.* Lib. II. cap. V. 19.

² Confess. Belgica, *Sylloge*, p. 234.

the subject of free will may be gathered from the third and fourth of the five articles to which the Arminian doctrines were reduced.

The third article says, that ‘man cannot attain to saving faith of his own free will, in regard that, living in an estate of sin and defection from God, he is not able of himself to think, will, or do anything which is really good.’ The fourth article runs thus, ‘The grace of God is the beginning, promotion, and accomplishment of every thing that is good in us; insomuch that the regenerate man can neither think, will, nor do anything that is good, or resist any sinful temptations without this grace preventing, co-operating, and assisting; and, consequently, all good works which any man can attain to, are to be attributed to the grace of God in Christ. But as for the manner of the co-operation of this grace, it is not irresistible; for it is said of many in Scripture that they did resist the Holy Ghost, as in Acts vii. and many other places¹.’

The disputes between the Remonstrants and their opponents led to the calling of a Synod at Dort, or Dordrecht, at which deputies were present from most of the protestant Churches of Europe. At this the Arminians were excommunicated, and the doctrines of the Swiss and Belgic reformed Churches declared to be decidedly Calvinistic, and intolerant of the opposite opinions². Both *election* and *reprobation* are declared to be of God alone³; but, at the same time, it is affirmed that God is not to be considered as the author of sin⁴; nor is it to be said that he works as logs or stocks, but rather by giving life and energy to their wills⁵. The decrees of the Synod are indeed generally esteemed decidedly supralapsarian, and were unsatis-

¹ Heylyn's *Hist. Quinq.* Part I. ch. v.; Mosheim, *Eccl. Hist.* Cent. xvii. Sect. II. Part II.

² Heylyn and Mosheim as above.

³ *Sylloge*, p. 406, Art. vi.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 409, Art. xv.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 431, Art. xvi.

factory to the English divines who were present during some of their discussions¹; but their language seems less exaggerated than some, who were opposed to them, have been inclined to represent it².

The Church of Rome, after the Council of Trent, was not exempt from the same controversies which divided the Protestants on grace and free will. Molina, a Jesuit, professor at Eboræ, in Portugal, in 1588, published a book entitled *Liberi arbitrii concordia cum Gratiæ donis, Divina Præscientia, Prædestinatione, et Reprobatione*. His theory was somewhat similar to that of the Arminians, who taught that grace was given according as God foresees that man would embrace and make good use of it. The Dominicans were much offended at this work, and accused the Jesuits of reviving Pelagianism. This led to a long and violent contention between the two orders, which caused Clement VIII. to appoint a sort of council, called the Congregation de Auxiliis³. The death of Clement VIII., before a settlement of these disputes, did not prevent their continuance under his successor, Paul V. And though Paul did not publicly declare for either side of the question, it is probable that he urged both parties to moderation, being deterred from pronouncing against the Jesuits by the patronage extended to them by the court of France, and from deciding against the Dominicans by the protection of the court of Spain⁴. The controversy, hushed for a time, broke out again in the year 1640, in consequence of the writings of Jansenius, bishop of Ypres, who revived the doctrines of Augustine, in his book entitled *Augustinus*. His followers were called Jansenists, and were strongly opposed by the Jesuits; the former maintaining the sentiments formerly held by Augustine, Thomas Aquinas,

¹ See Bp. Hall's *Observations on some Specialities in his Life*.

² See, for example, Heylyn, *H. Q.* Part I. ch. vi.

³ Mosheim, Cent. xvi. Sect. iii. Part I.

⁴ Mosheim, Cent. xvii. Sect. ii. Part I. § 35.

and the Dominicans, the latter holding those of Duns Scotus and the Franciscans. The book of Jansenius was first condemned as a breach of the concord which had been enjoined in the Church, but was afterwards more distinctly prohibited by a solemn bull of Pope Urban VIII., A.D. 1642. The Jansenists, however, continued to prosper, numbering many able and pious men in their ranks, and appealing to miracles in support of their opinions. But ultimately they were condemned and persecuted by the Bishops of Rome, and the dominant faction of the Church¹.

Before concluding this sketch of the different controversies in other countries, we must mention the Socinian opinions on free will; which, of course correspond with their views of original sin; as they appear to consider that man's will is so far free and strong as to need only external, and not internal help towards his sanctification².

After the Reformation, or during the establishment of it in *England*, the first thing which particularly claims our attention is the Article of Free Will in the *Necessary Doctrine*, set forth by King Henry VIII. and signed by Convocation, A.D. 1543. In this it is said, that 'man has free will now after the fall of Adam;' and free will is defined as 'a power of reason and will, by which good is chosen by the assistance of grace, or evil is chosen without the assistance of the same³.'

The reformers in the reign of Edward VI. appear to have followed closely upon the steps of the Lutherans (Melancthon and the Confession of Augsburgh), in the Articles which concern grace and free will⁴. The Article on free will, in the forty-two Articles of 1552, was immediately succeeded by an Article on grace which was worded as follows.

¹ Mosheim, Cent. xvii. Sect. ii. Part i. § 40.

² Ibid. Cent. xvi. Sect. iii. Part ii. 17.

³ *Formularies of Faith in the reign of Henry VIII.*, p. 359, where see the Article of Free Will at length.

⁴ See Laurence, *B. L.* passim, especially Sermon v.

‘OF GRACE.

‘The grace of Christ, or the Holy Ghost by Him given, doth take away the stony heart and giveth an heart of flesh. And although those, who have no will to good things, He maketh them will, and those, that would evil things, He maketh them not to will; yet nevertheless He enforceth not the will. And therefore no man, when he sinneth, can excuse himself as not worthy to be blamed or condemned, by alleging that he sinned unwillingly or by compulsion.’

The private teaching of the reformers corresponded with these public declarations. Whilst they taught that ‘to do anything which is acceptable to God, we cannot do it without the grace of God, nor yet will it, nor assent to it,’ they said also, that the ‘grace of God healeth our evil will, and maketh it agreeing to His Godly will, so that we willingly and with gladness do those things which God commandeth¹.’

But during the Marian persecution the English divines, who fled to Frankfort and other places on the Continent, by being thrown into contact with foreign reformers, were drawn into the controversies which agitated them. Many came back with strong prejudices in favour of the Calvinists, whilst others were strongly disposed to maintain Lutheran views. There were therefore three distinct parties in the Church in the early part of the reign of Elizabeth. Some were for the restoration of popery, others inclined to Lutheran views of grace and of the Sacraments, and a third party had imbibed Calvinistic sentiments of predestination and church discipline, and Zuinglian sentiments on sacramental grace. The last were the forerunners of the Puritans, who soon became non-conformists, and finally dissenters. They acquired the name of Gospellers, and called their opponents Freewillers. Archbishop Parker and the leading men of the day wisely strove to heal the divisions,

¹ Ridley, *On the Philippians*, i. 3—8.

and softened down the language of our formularies, so as to include as many as possible within the pale of the National Church: and among other measures of conciliation the *Article on Grace* was omitted to satisfy the Calvinistic section of the Church¹.

The controversies, however, between the high Church and the Puritan divines, both on points of doctrine and of discipline, continued to divide the Church. Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury, in doctrine agreed with Calvin, but in discipline was a high Episcopalian. During his primacy were drawn up the famous Lambeth Articles, which he would gladly have imposed on the Church, but which never received the authority of the queen, the parliament, or the convocation. The first of these Articles says that ‘God hath from eternity predestinated some men to life, others He has reprobated to death:’ and the ninth asserts that ‘it is not in the will of every one to be saved².’

In the conference held at Hampton Court in the reign of King James I. A.D. 1603, an effort was made on the part of the Puritan divines to obtain an alteration in some of the XXXIX. Articles, and to have them made more conformable to Calvinistic language; but no alteration was effected, owing to the opposition of the King and of the Bishops to the arguments of the Puritans³.

The Articles remain therefore as they were put forth in 1562, and afterwards in 1571. And those on the subject of grace, free will, and other similar subjects, are the same as those drawn up in 1552, by Cranmer and his fellows, with the exception of the omission of the Article on Grace, which was then

¹ Heylyn's *H. Q.* Part III. ch. xvii. On the state of parties, &c. in Elizabeth's reign, see Soames' *Elizabethan Religious History*.

² Heylyn's *H. Q.* Part III. ch. xx.

³ Heylyn, Part III. ch. xxii.; Cardwell's *History of Conferences*, p. 178, &c.

the tenth Article, and the prefixing of the first part of the present tenth (originally the ninth Article) down to the word 'wherefore.'

There have been ever since the reign of Elizabeth two parties in the English Church, one holding the doctrines of Calvin, and the other opposing those doctrines, and each party has considered the Articles to speak their own language. It is however an undoubted truth that the Articles were drawn up before Calvin's works had become extensively known, or had become in any degree popular in this country. It is probable that they speak the language neither of Calvin, nor of Arminius; and between the extreme opinions, which had prevailed among the Schoolmen and others, they held a middle course, carefully avoiding the dogma of congruous merit, maintaining jealously the absolute necessity of preventing grace to enable us to will or to do according to the commandments of God, but not minutely entering into the questions concerning the freedom of man before the fall, or the degree of free agency left to him since the fall.

SECTION II.

SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

THE ninth Article having asserted that man by the fall is 'very far gone from original righteousness,' there arises at once a probability that he is weak and helpless towards good. In reasoning therefore on that Article it was natural in some degree to anticipate some of the conclusions of this.

Yet still, unless it be clearly conceded, that, by the fall, man became *totally* corrupt, with no shadow of the image of God in which he was created, and with a mind nearly approaching, if not actually similar to the mind of devils; it would be possible, that such a degree of strength might remain to him, that he might make some independent efforts towards holiness, and in some degree prepare himself for the reception of grace. As therefore the ninth Article does not define the exact amount of man's defection from original righteousness, it was quite necessary to state the doctrine of his utter helplessness in this.

The subject, as it is stated in the Article, seems to divide itself into the two following heads.

I. Since the fall man has no power by his own natural strength to turn himself to faith and godliness, or to do good works acceptable to God. But the grace of God is absolutely necessary to enable him to do this.

II. The grace of God acts in two ways.

1 First, it is preventing grace, giving a good will.

2 Afterwards, it is co-operating grace working in and with us, when we have that good will.

I. First, then, since the fall, man has no power by his own natural strength to turn himself to faith and holiness, or to do good works acceptable to God. But the grace of God is absolutely necessary to enable him to do this.

Here the point to be proved is simply this. Whatever degree of defection is implied in the fall, whatever natural amiability any individuals of the human race may possess, no one, by mere natural strength, and without internal help from God, can believe or do what is, in a religious point of view, pleasing or acceptable to God.

1 In the sixth chapter of St. John our Lord says, 'No man can come unto Me, except the Father which hath sent Me draw him' (ver. 44); and again, 'Therefore said I unto you, no man can come unto Me, except it were given him of My Father' (ver. 65).

Now here the proposition is quite general. All mankind are included in the sentence, 'No man can come' to Christ, except it be given him of God, except God the Father draw him. This is a plain statement of natural weakness, and of the need of preventing grace. It shews that by nature man is apart from Christ, and that only the gift of God and the drawing of God can bring him to Christ.

To this argument the Pelagians answer, that no doubt it is necessary that God should draw us, if we are to come to Him; but the way in which He draws us, is not by internal assistance and the motions of His Spirit in our hearts, but externally, by the calls of His word, the warnings of His Providence, the ordinances of His Church. Thus, therefore, say they, He may be said to draw us, and thus it is given us of Him to come to Christ. But we may reply to this objection, that such an interpretation is inconsistent with the whole drift of our Lord's discourse. The Capharnaite Jews, who heard Him, were staggered at His sayings, and disbelieved them. Externally the word of God was drawing them then, but they murmured

against it, and refused to listen to it. Accordingly our Lord tells them that it was from an absence of *inward* sanctification that they rejected the *outward* calls of His word. If they came to Him, it must be by the drawing of the Father, through the grace of His Spirit ; for, says He, ‘ No man can come to Me, except the Father, which hath sent Me, draw him ; and I will raise him up at the last day. As it is written, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and that hath learned of the Father, cometh unto Me’ vv. 44, 45. If by these words is meant only the outward drawing by external means, it is plain that all who heard Him had such drawing in its most efficient form ; yet most of them rejected Him. It is evident that they lacked something more than this. That being taught of God, that learning of the Father, which would bring them to Christ, must therefore have been something within them, not the calls of His Word without ; and hence we may conclude that our Lord’s words shew it to be an invariable rule, a truth coextensive with the nature of fallen man, that no one can come to Christ, or, what is the same thing, turn and prepare himself to faith and calling upon God, without the internal operations of the Spirit of God.

2 To confirm this view of the subject, let us recur to what we saw, in considering the ninth Article, was the doctrine of Scripture concerning our original corruption.

Our Lord states (John viii. 34) that ‘ whosoever committeth sin is the servant (*δούλος the slave*) of sin.’ Now all men by nature commit sin, and therefore are slaves of sin. This is what St. Paul calls ‘ the bondage of corruption’ (Rom. viii. 21). This natural state of man is, both by our Lord and by the Apostle, contrasted with the liberty of the soul under a state of grace. ‘ If the Son shall make you free ye shall be free indeed,’ (John viii. 36) says Christ, and St. Paul calls it ‘ the glorious liberty of the children of God’ (Rom. viii. 21). In like manner our Lord distinguishes between the state of a servant

and the state of a son (John viii. 35). Nay, so complete is this servitude of sin by nature, that St. Paul, more than once, calls it *death*. He speaks of people by nature as '*dead* in trespasses and sin' (Ephes. ii. 1; Col. ii. 13). He says of those, who had been delivered from this state by grace, that 'God had *quickened* them together with Christ' (Ephes. ii. 5); that those, who were baptized into the death of Christ, having been *dead* in trespasses and sins, God had *quickened* together with Him' (Col. ii. 12, 13). Now slavery and death are the strongest terms to express utter helplessness, that language admits of. So, freeing from slavery and quickening or raising to life, as plainly as possible, indicate a free gift, independent of the will or power of the recipient, and shew that the recipient must previously have been in a condition as unable to free himself as the bondsman, as unable to quicken himself as a dead man.

In accordance with all this, St. Paul (in Rom. vii. viii. a passage considered in the last Article) argues at length, that man, being by nature 'carnal, sold under sin,' even if able to admire what is good, was utterly unable to perform it (Rom. vii. 14—21), there being a law, ruling in his members, which makes him captive to the law of sin (v. 23). And then he tells us, that the way in which this bondage must be broken is by the Spirit of God taking possession of, and ruling in that heart, in which before sin had ruled, and so delivering it from the law of sin. 'For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death' (viii. 2).

Not only is such helplessness of the unregenerate man plainly taught by our Lord and His Apostles; but we farther find that the very mind and understanding are represented as darkened by the natural state of corruption, and so incapable of comprehending and appreciating spiritual truth, until enlightened by the Spirit of God. Thus 'the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God;....neither can he

know them, because they are spiritually discerned' (1 Cor. ii. 14, comp. Rom. viii. 5, 6, 7 ; Jude, 19). Man by nature has no discernment of those things which belong to the Spirit of God ; and if so, it is quite clear that if he ever attains to spiritual discernment, it must be given him preternaturally.

To this belong all the passages concerning the new birth ; for if a new birth be necessary, there must, before it, be an absence of that life, which is the product of such a birth. Accordingly, God is represented as begetting us of His own will (James i. 18). To enter into the kingdom, a man must be born again, of water and of the *Spirit* (John iii. 3, 5). In Christ Jesus a new creation availeth (Gal. vi. 15). It is not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His own mercy that God saveth us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost (Tit. iii. 5).

In like manner the Scriptures, when speaking of the good works of Christians, represent them as due, not to any independent effort of the human will, but altogether to the grace of God working in them. Thus our Lord in a parable fully declares the whole source and spring of Christian holiness to be the life and virtue derived from Him. He likens Himself to a Vine, and all His disciples to branches. We know that branches of a tree derive life and strength from the sap, which is sent into them from the root and stem. In like manner our Lord tells us, that, by being branches of Him, we may bring forth good fruit, but that, apart from Him, we can do nothing. 'Abide in Me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine ; no more can ye, except ye abide in Me. I am the Vine, ye are the branches. He that abideth in Me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit ; for without Me (*χωρὶς ἐμοῦ* apart from Me) ye can do nothing' (John xv. 4, 5).

So constantly is this dependence of the Christian upon Divine grace urged by the sacred writers, that they frequently

call to our remembrance not only that we owe our first turning from evil to the quickening of God's Spirit, but that even the regenerate and the faithful believer is at every step dependent upon the illumination, guidance, strength and support of the same Divine Comforter and Guide. So St. Paul, writing of himself and other regenerate Christians, says, 'Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves: but our sufficiency is of God' (2 Cor. iii. 5). When urging his faithful converts to 'work out their own salvation with fear and trembling,' he adds, as an encouragement to them, 'For it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure' (Phil. ii. 13). And when speaking with thankfulness of the labours which he himself had been enabled to undergo for the sake of the Gospel, he adds, 'Yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me' (1 Cor. xv. 10).

Now all this language of Scripture seems plainly to prove that by nature man has no free will to do good, no power to make independent efforts towards holiness. There is an iron tyranny, a law of sin and death, which keeps him in bondage and deprives him of the power to escape, and even of the discernment of spiritual things, which would make him desire deliverance. From this law of sin and death the Spirit of life can set him free; from this bondage the Son can make him free indeed; but none besides. Nay! he is sleeping the sleep of spiritual death, and therefore needs internal, as well as external aid to rouse him, nay! a new creation, a new birth, a new life. And even when set free, quickened, regenerate, he continues still able to act and think uprightly, only so long as he derives strength from Christ; just as the branch can bear no fruit, except it derive sap and strength from the stem on which it grows.

II. It being thus proved that by nature man, corrupted by the fall, is not in possession of free will; or more properly,

that his will, though unrestrained by God, is yet warped and led captive by evil spirits and his own bad propensities; it remains that we consider the effects of God's grace upon the will, when setting it free from this captivity. The Article describes these effects as follows:

1 God's grace prevents us that we may have a good will.

2 It works in us, or with us, when we have that good will.

The passages of Scripture, which have been already brought to bear in the former division of the subject, may appear to have sufficiently demonstrated these two propositions.

1 The necessity of preventing grace follows, of course, from the doctrine that man, of himself, cannot turn to God. For, if he cannot turn of himself, he must either remain for ever alienated, or must need some power to turn him. In the language of the prophet, 'Turn Thou me, and I shall be turned' (Jer. xxxi. 18). Accordingly we read continually of the first turning of the heart as coming from God. God is said to be 'found of them that sought Him not, and made manifest to them that asked not after Him' (Isai. lxv. 1; Rom. x. 10). We read of His opening people's 'hearts so that they attend to the things spoken' (Acts xvi. 14); and we are taught that He 'worketh in us both to *will* and to do' (Phil. ii. 13); so that the regenerate and sanctified Christian is declared to be God's '*workmanship* created in Christ Jesus unto good works' (Eph. ii. 10). God is said to have 'wrought' believers for immortality and glory (2 Cor. v. 5). The 'new man' is said to be '*created* in righteousness and true holiness' (Eph. iv. 24).

Such passages and all others, which speak of new birth and new creation, shew plainly that God's grace prevents us, waits not, that is, for us to make advances to Him, but graciously comes forward to help us, whilst yet we are without strength. They shew too that, whereas by nature the will was corrupt

and not tending to God, bound down, and taken captive to the law of sin, so when the grace of God renews it, it is no longer in slavery, but free, choosing life and holiness, not by compulsion, but by free choice and love. 'The Son makes us free indeed' (John viii. 36). 'The law of the spirit of life makes us free from the law of sin and death' (Rom. viii. 2). There is a 'glorious liberty for the children of God' (Rom. viii. 21). It is 'to liberty' that we 'have been called' (Gal. v. 13); for 'where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty' (2 Cor. iii. 17).

We see then the contrast, which exists between the will in its natural corrupt state, and the will in its regenerate and purified state. In the former it is enslaved, in the latter it is free. Satan keeps it a bonds slave in the first; God sets it free in the last. Then it could only choose evil; now it is free to choose good. Then under the law of sin and death; now under 'the perfect law of liberty' (James i. 25).

2 But the will, thus set free, needs farther support, guidance, and strength. The newborn Christian has still a conflict to undergo, for which he requires the whole armour of God. This is expressed in the Article, by the words 'working with us when we have that good will.'

The Latin Article has the word *cooperante*, which in the first English translation was rendered 'working in us;' but in 1572 it was expressed somewhat more closely after the Latin, 'working with us.'

Such expressions, of course, imply that, when the will is renewed, there is need of farther grace to support it, but, at the same time, that the renewed man is to exert himself in the strength of that grace, and to work under its influence.

The doctrine of co-operation has been opposed by many as assigning too much strength to man. Man, say they, is altogether too weak either to begin the work of grace, or even, after that work is begun, to contribute anything towards its

completion. It is patching the pure robe of Christ's righteousness to add any of the filthy rags of man's works to it. Accordingly, St. Paul attributes all his own labours, not to himself, but to 'the grace of God which was with him' (1 Cor. xv. 10); and says, 'I no longer live myself ($\zeta\omega\ \delta\epsilon\ \sigma\upsilon\kappa\epsilon\rho\iota\ \epsilon\gamma\omega$), but Christ liveth in me' (Gal. ii. 20). And it is written that God worketh *in* us, not *with* us, 'both to will and to do' (Phil. ii. 12).

Whether co-operation be a good expression or not, and whether it be altogether reverent to speak as if the Holy Spirit of God and man's renewed will act in concert together, is of course fairly open to question. In general, no doubt, the Scriptures speak of God's working *in* us, rather than *with* us. Yet the doctrine of our Article, rightly understood, rests on a sound foundation.

In the first instance indeed man's will is represented as being under bondage. Spiritually we are described as slaves, blind, dead. But, as we have seen, the Son is said to 'make us free;' the 'law of the Spirit of life frees us from the law of sin and death;' and so we are brought into 'the glorious liberty of the children of God.' Thus it appears that Christ's service is indeed perfect freedom. The will, no longer enslaved and bound down, is set at liberty, and enabled to act; and though, whenever and howsoever it acts in a good direction, it is always acting under the guidance and governance of the Spirit of God, yet it does not follow that that guidance is a yoke of bondage, or of irresistible necessity. Accordingly, when the Apostle has explained how the Spirit frees us from the law of sin, and brings us into the glorious liberty of God's children (Rom. viii. 2—21), he tells us a little farther on, that, whereas we still continue weak and ignorant, 'the Spirit *helpeth* our infirmities' (ver. 26). In the very same breath in which he tells us that 'it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do,' he bids us 'work out our own salvation with fear and trembling' (Phil. ii. 12, 13).

And so he speaks of himself as using all kinds of self-discipline (1 Cor. ix. 27), and as ‘pressing forward to the mark for the prize of the high calling’ (Phil. iii. 14).

To this purpose are all the exhortations of Scripture addressed to those who are under grace, not to miss the blessings which God has prepared for them. For example, we have warnings not to ‘defile the temple of God,’ i.e. not to pollute with sin our bodies, in which God’s Spirit dwells (1 Cor. iii. 17); not to grieve, not to quench the Spirit (Eph. iv. 30; 1 Thess. v. 19); not to neglect the gift which is in us, but to stir it up (1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6); not to ‘receive the grace of God in vain’ (2 Cor. vi. 1); ‘to stand fast,’ and not ‘fall from grace’ (Gal. v. 1—4); ‘to take heed lest there be an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God’ (Heb. iii. 12); to ‘look diligently, lest any man fail of the grace of God’ (Heb. xii. 15); when we think we are standing, ‘to take heed lest we fall’ (1 Cor. x. 12).

Now all such passages do indeed plainly presuppose that all the good we can do comes from the Spirit of God working in us. Yet they seem as plainly to prove, that that blessed Spirit does not move the will as a mere machine, so that it is impossible for it to resist or neglect His blessed influences. It seems plain from them, that, under those influences, and guided by them, the renewed heart moves willingly; and that, whenever those influences do not produce their full effect, it is because the remains of corruption in that heart resist and counteract them. And this is all that is meant in the Article by the term *co-operante*, ‘working with us.’

If, indeed, according to the sentiment of Luther, quoted in the former section, man’s will was first a mere bonds slave of sin, and after grace equally a slave, or machine, moved passively and irresistibly by the Spirit, we can hardly understand how it should be, that men are not all equally abandoned before grace, and all equally moving onward to perfection under grace. Since,

by that theory, the will is entirely passive under the motions of the Spirit, opposing no obstacle to them, and therefore, as we should suppose, likely in all persons to be fully and perfectly sanctified.

The doctrine of Scripture, however, is evidently expressed in the words of our Article. God must give the will, must set the will free from its natural slavery before it can turn to good ; but then it moves in the freedom which He has bestowed upon it, and never so truly useth that freedom as when it follows the motions of the Spirit. Yet clearly there remains some power to resist and to do evil. For, though ‘ those that have no will to good things God maketh them to will ;... Yet, nevertheless, He enforceth not the will¹.’ And so, although He must work in us, yet we, under His influences, must strive and press forward, not resisting Him, not neglecting, but stirring up His gifts in our hearts.

¹ Art. of 1552.

ARTICLE XI.

Of the Justification of Man.

WE are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings: Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.

De hominis Justificatione.

TANTUM propter meritum Domini et Servatoris nostri Jesu Christi, per fidem, non propter opera et merita nostra, justi coram Deo reputamur. Quare sola fide nos justificari, doctrina est saluberrima, ac consolationis plenissima, ut in homilia de justificatione hominis fusiùs explicatur.

SECTION I.

HISTORY.

IT is probable that natural religion inclines all men, uninstructed by Revelation, to seek for pardon and acceptance with God, either by attempting to live up to His law, or by making some personal sacrifices as an atonement for offences against it. The robe laid before the statue of Athena, or the hecatomb offered to Phœbus, were to compensate for sins against their divinity.

If we look to Jewish history, we shall find the prophets remonstrating with the Israelites for thinking that ceremonial observances would satisfy for the breach of God's commandments, and their sincerest penitents acknowledging that sacrifices would not profit them, but that they needed to be purged as with hyssop, and new created in heart (Psalm li.). Hence we may readily see, that the temptation of the Jews was to seek God's favour, when they had fallen from it, by ceremonial

rites, without sufficient reference to the spirit of the ritual; as with many it was to seek the same favour by a rigid observance of a mere formal obedience, such as our Lord reproves in the Pharisees, and as St. Paul declares to have been the cause of the fall of his countrymen (Rom. ix. 31, 32). The Rabbins appear to have taught that a man's good deeds would be weighed against his bad; and that if the former preponderated, he would be accepted and rewarded¹. And forgetting or neglecting the spiritual significance of their prophecies and sacrifices, they expected a Messiah indeed, but a triumphant conqueror, not one who by His death would expiate their sins; and so the Cross of Christ was a stumbling-block and offence to them. They were profoundly ignorant that Christ should be to them 'the end of the Law for righteousness,' that by Him alone all who believed in Him, should receive justification and life².

It has been thought also that some among the Jews held that a man would be saved, even without holiness, who simply embraced the creed of Abraham, acknowledging the unity of the Godhead and the Resurrection of the dead; a view which seems to have been adopted by Mohammed in the Koran. Accordingly it has been said, that, as St. Paul in his Epistles condemned the former error of his fellow-countrymen, so St. James directed his Epistle against the latter; the one shewing that neither ceremonial observances nor legal obedience could satisfy the demands of God's justice, but that an atonement and true faith were necessary: the other that a mere creed was not calculated to please God, when the life was not consistent with it³.

¹ See Bull, *Harmon. Apost.* ii. xvi. 8.

² Ibid. ii. xvii. 3.

³ See Michaelis, *Introduction to the New Testament*, Vol. iv. ch. xxvi. who considers this to have been the cause of St. James' argument on Mention, and that his Epistle was written before St. Paul's, or at least before he had seen St. Paul's writings.

The sentiments of the fathers on the subject of justification have afforded matter for much discussion. According to some, they taught nearly the doctrine of the Council of Trent; according to others, they nearly spoke the language of Luther. The truth appears to lie in neither of these statements. Justification had not been in early times the cause of much debate. No fierce contests had arisen upon it. Hence no need was felt for accurate definitions concerning it. The statements of the fathers are therefore generally rather practical than formal. They dwell much on the Atonement, and the meritorious cause of pardon; so much so, that they could see the blood of Christ in the scarlet thread which Rahab tied in her window, and His Cross in the stretched out hands of Moses, when Israel prevailed over Midian¹. But they do not appear ever to have entered thoroughly into the question of justification, as it was afterwards debated in the time of the schoolmen, and, still more, of the reformers.

It is remarkable that probably the most express statement on the subject, which occurs in all the writings of the fathers, is to be found in the very earliest of all, Clement of Rome. Speaking of faithful men of old, he writes 'They were all therefore greatly glorified, not for their own sake, or for their own works, or for the righteousness that they themselves wrought; but through His will. And we also, being called by the same will in Christ Jesus, are not justified by ourselves, neither by our own wisdom, or knowledge, or piety, or any works which we did in holiness of heart, but by that faith by which God Almighty has justified all men from the beginning: to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen².'

The passage is important not only because of its antiquity, but because of its distinctness. The word 'justify' appears to

¹ Clem. Rom. *Epist.* i. *ad Corinth*, 12. Barnab. *Epist.* 12.

² Clem. Rom. *Epist.* i. Cap. 32.

be used, as our Article uses it, for 'to account righteous;' not as the Council of Trent for 'to make righteous' by infusion of holiness; and the instrument of such justification is declared to be and ever to have been, not 'wisdom, knowledge, piety, or works done in holiness of heart,' but 'faith¹.'

With regard to the statements of the later fathers, we must carefully bear in mind that, without question, they attributed the salvation of man solely and perfectly to the blood of Christ; that they did not look to be saved because they had deserved salvation, but because Christ had satisfied for their sins; but though this is thus far plain, it will not enable us to come to any certain conclusion as to their views concerning the doctrine of justification scholastically considered.

Such passages as the following shew the spirit of the

¹ Πάντες οὖν ἐδοξάσθησαν, οὐ δι' αὐτῶν, ἢ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν, ἢ διὰ τῆς δικαιοπραγίας ἧς κατειργάσαντο, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν διὰ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦς κληθέντες, οὐ δι' ἑαυτῶν δικαιούμεθα, οὐδὲ διὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας σοφίας, ἢ συνέσεως, ἢ εὐσεβείας, ἢ ἔργων ὧν κατειργασάμεθα ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδίας· ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς πίστεως, δι' ἧς πάντα τοὺς ἀπ' αἰῶνος ὁ παντοκράτωρ Θεὸς ἐδικαίωσεν· ᾧ ἔστω δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

Almost the only question which may be raised on the passage is, Does St. Clement contrast faith with works done before the grace of God, or works after the grace of God, i. e. evangelical works? Dr. Waterland says, 'It is of great weight with him, that so early and so considerable a writer as Clement of Rome, an apostolical man, should so interpret the doctrine of *justifying faith*, as to oppose it plainly even to evangelical works, however exalted.'—Works, Vol. ix p. 452. Mr. Faber thinks that 'Indisputably by the very force and tenor of their definition, (i. e. as being works done in holiness of heart) they are works performed after the infusion of holiness into the heart by the gracious Spirit of God.'—*Primitive Doctrine of Justification*, p. 83. Mr. Newman, on the other hand, contends that 'in holiness of heart' means no more than 'piously,' 'holily:' and that 'works which we did in holiness of heart' (as the article is omitted before ἔργων, though not before the former substantives σοφίας, εὐσεβείας, &c., and the verb κατειργασάμεθα is in the aorist) would more naturally, though perhaps not necessarily, signify an hypothetical, not a real case, as in those words of St. Jerom afterwards quoted by Mr. Faber, p. 122, 'Convertentem impium per solam fidem justificat Deus, non per opera quæ non habuit.'—Newman, *On Justification*, p. 436.

fathers as regards their reliance on the Atonement of Christ. 'Let us without ceasing hold stedfastly to Him, who is our hope, and the earnest of our righteousness, even Jesus Christ, who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree; who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth; but suffered all for us that we might live through Him¹.'

'For this cause did our Lord vouchsafe to give up His body to destruction, that through the forgiveness of our sins we might be sanctified; that is, by the sprinkling of His blood².'

'By His stripes healing is conferred on all who come to the Father by Him³.'

'All men fall short of the glory of God, and are justified not by themselves, but by the coming of the Lord⁴.'

'I will not glory because I am righteous, but because I am redeemed. I will glory not because I am free from sins, but because my sins are forgiven me; not because I have profited, nor because any one hath profited me, but because Christ is my Advocate with the Father, and because Christ's blood hath been shed for me⁵.'

'Our righteousness...is such in this life, that it consists rather in remission of sins than in perfection of virtues⁶.'

'Not to commit sin, is the righteousness of God; but man's righteousness consists in the mercy of God⁷.'

Thus far it is plain that the fathers believed what the Scriptures taught and what the Article of our Church maintains, that 'we are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and not for our

¹ Polycarp, Epist. viii.

² Barnab. Ep. v.

³ Just. M. *Dial.* p. 366. See also Bp. Kaye's *Justin Martyr*, p. 77.

⁴ Iren. iv. xxxvii. See also Beaven's *Irenæus*, p. 194.

⁵ Ambros. *De Jacobo et Vita Beat.* i. 6. See Newman, *On Justification*, p. 401.

⁶ August. *De Civit.* xix. 27. See Calvin. *Institut.* iii. 12.

⁷ Non peccare Dei est justitia; hominis autem justitia, Dei indulgentia.—Bernard, Sermon. 21 et 23 in Cantic. Calvin, *Institut.* iii. 12.

own works or deservings.' And if anywhere they seem to speak a language not strictly in accordance with this doctrine, we ought in fairness to conclude that they do not mean really to contradict themselves, though they speak broadly and as the Scriptures speak, concerning the necessity of that 'holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.' But when we come to technical terms, and express definitions, we shall find considerable difficulty in ascertaining the sense attached to them in the patristic writings. We have already seen something like a distinct statement in Clement of Rome; and something nearly approaching it may be found in those who followed him. A few examples I have thrown into the note¹. Yet it seems, on a general examination of the most remarkable passages from the ancient writings on this subject, that it is extremely difficult to say whether the fathers always understood the word

¹ Οὐ γὰρ δὴ γε εἰς βαλανεῖον ὑμᾶς ἔπεμπεν Ἡσαΐας ἀπολουσομένους ἐκεῖ τὸν φόνον καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἁμαρτίας, οὐς οὐδὲ τὸ τῆς θαλάσσης ἱκανὸν πᾶν ὕδωρ καθαρίσαι, ἀλλὰ ὡς εἰκὸς πάλαι τοῦτο ἐκεῖνο τὸ σωτήριον λουτρὸν ἦν, ὃ εἶπετο τοῖς μεταγινώσκουσι, καὶ μηκέτι αἵματι τράγων καὶ προβάτων ἢ σποδῷ δαμάλεως, ἢ σεμιδάλεως προσφοραῖς καθαριζομένους, ἀλλὰ πίσκει διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ὃς διὰ τοῦτο ἀπέθανεν. κ.τ.λ.—Just. M. *Dial.* p. 229. d.

Non incognitus igitur erat Dominus Abrahæ, cujus diem concupivit videre: sed neque Pater Domini; didicerat enim a Verbo Domini, et credidit ei; quapropter et deputatum est ei ad justitiam a Domino. Fides enim quæ est ad Deum altissimum justificat hominem.—Irenæ. iv. 13. See also iv. 27.

His igitur consideratis pertractatisque pro viribus quas Dominus donare dignatur, colligimus non justificari hominem præceptis bonæ vitæ nisi per fidem Jesu Christi, hoc est non lege operum sed fidei; non litera sed spiritu, non factorum meritis sed gratuita gratia.—August. *De Spiritu et Litera*, cap. 22.

Convertentem impium per solam fidem justificat Deus, non opera bona quæ non habuit: alioquin per impietatis opera fuerat puniendus. Simul attende, quia non peccatorem dicit justificari per fidem sed impium, hoc est, nuper credentem asseruit.

Secundum propositum gratiæ Dei.] Qui proposuit gratis per solam fidem peccata dimittere.—Hieron. in *Epist. ad Rom.* cap. iv. See also in *Epist. ad Galat.* cap. iii.

‘justification’ in a forensic sense, as signifying acquittal from guilt and imputation of righteousness, or rather, as, in addition to that, containing in it the notion of infusion of righteousness. It has already been observed that we must not expect in their words the precision of controversy, where no controversy had been raised. In order of time acquittal from guilt and infusion of righteousness (or what in modern Theology have been called justification and sanctification) go together, and are never separated. Therefore, though at times the fathers seem to use the term ‘justification’ merely in its forensic sense, yet sometimes they speak too as if it included the idea of making just, as well as of esteeming just.

For example, in one place St. Chrysostom (on Rom. viii. 33: ‘It is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth?’) writes: ‘He does not say, it is God that forgave our sins, but, what is much greater, *It is God that justifieth*. For when the Judge’s sentence declares us just (*δικαίους ἀποφαίνει*) and such a Judge too, what signifieth the accuser¹?’ Here he seems to speak as if he considered justification as no more than ‘declaring or pronouncing just.’ Yet, in other parts of the same work, he clearly shews that in justification he considered something more to be included than remission and acquittal. Thus, in the Eighth Homily on Rom. iv. 7 (‘Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven,’) we read: ‘He seems to be bringing a testimony beside his purpose. For it does not say, Blessed are they whose faith is reckoned for righteousness. But he does so purposely, not inadvertently, to shew the greater excellence. For if he be blessed that by grace received forgiveness, much more he that is made just and that manifests faith.’ Again, Homil. x. on Rom. v. 16, (‘the free gift is of many offences unto justification’) he argues that ‘it was not only that sins were done away, but that righteousness was given.’ It is true

¹ *Homil. in Ep. ad Rom. xv.* See also Hom. vii. on chap. iii. 27.

that to be esteemed righteous is more than to be esteemed sinless; as the one would only deliver from punishment, the other give a right to reward: and so St. Chrysostom may only mean that justification is more than pardon, because to be accounted righteous is more than to be acquitted of guilt. But it appears to have been common to many of the fathers to leave in some uncertainty the question, whether justification did or did not contain in it the making that, of which it involved the imputation.

This is especially observable in the works of St. Augustine. For example, in the 45th chapter of the *De Spiritu et Litera*, where he is reasoning on the words of St. Paul, 'The doers of the Law shall be justified.' He asks 'What is to be justified but to be made just by Him who justifies the ungodly, so that from ungodly, he becomes just?' and so he concludes that by this phrase St. Paul means that 'they shall be made just, who before were not so, not who before were just; that so the Jews, who were hearers of the Law, might understand that they need the grace of a justifier that they might become doers of the Law.' Or else, he proposes to interpret it in the other way, '*shall be justified*, as though it were said, shall be held and accounted righteous; just as it is said of a certain one, *He willing to justify himself*, that is, to be held and esteemed just.' So then Augustine appears to leave it an open question, whether to *justify* is to *make*, or to *esteem* and *hold* as righteous.

Yet, though there be such ambiguity, we need be but little solicitous on the subject; but rather conclude, that 'the point having never been discussed, and those fathers never having thoroughly considered the sense of St. Paul, might unawares take the word (justify) as it sounded in the Latin, especially the sense they affixed to it, signifying a matter very true and certain in Christianity¹.'

¹ Barrow, Vol. II. Sermon V. on *Justification by Faith*.

Dr. Waterland, in his treatise on *Justification*¹, has collected a great number of passages from the fathers, to shew that they considered every person at his baptism to receive the gift of justification. Our limits will not allow us to follow him at length. But if we take justification to mean remission of sin and admission into God's favour, it needs but very slight acquaintance with the writings of the early Christians to know, that as they confessed their faith 'in one baptism for the remission of sins,' so they universally taught that all persons duly receiving baptism, and not hindering the grace of God by unbelief and impenitence, obtained in baptism pardon for sin, admission into the Christian Church and covenant, and the assistance of the Holy Spirit of God; and that so they were thenceforth 'children of God, members of Christ, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven.'

To sum up what has been said. In the essence of this Article the fathers' language is clear. They held that all hope of salvation must spring from the mercy of God through the merits of Christ. They taught that every person baptized (not forfeiting the grace by sin and impenitence) was looked on as a member of the body of the faithful, and so in favour with God. They spoke too of faith, as that state of salvation in which we receive justification and life. But (if at least we make some exceptions) they do not speak in the clear and controversial language of later days; nor is it always certain whether by the word *justified* they understand that a man's faith is accounted to him for righteousness, or that, being the great sanctifying principle, it is the instrument whereby God works in him holiness.

It would be beside our purpose and exceed our limits to investigate at length the definitions of the schoolmen. Learned discussions are liable to much misunderstanding. But the im-

¹ Waterland's Works, Vol. ix. p. 442.

pressions popularly conveyed by the teaching of the scholastic divines, and especially the view which was taken of them by Luther and their opponents, are very important to our right apprehension of the controversy at the time of the Reformation.

In the first place it appears, that the schoolmen generally understood justification to mean not infusion of righteousness, but forgiveness of sins. It is true they looked on it as the immediate result of, and as inseparably connected with grace infused; but their definitions made justification to mean, not the making righteous, but the declaring righteous¹.

It is not to be supposed that they denied or doubted that such justification sprang primarily from the grace of God, and meritoriously from the death of Christ. The faults charged upon their system are, that they looked for merit *de congruo*, and *de condigno*, that they attached efficacy to attrition, that they inculcated the doctrine of satisfaction, and that they assigned grace to the sacraments *ex opere operato*.

Luther especially insists that these scholastic opinions were directly subversive of the doctrine of St. Paul, and of the grace of God. 'They say,' he writes, 'that a good work before grace is able to obtain grace of congruity, (which they call *meritum de congruo*) because it is meet that God should reward such a work. But when grace is obtained, the work following deserveth eternal life of debt and worthiness, which they call *meritum de condigno*. . . . For the first God is no debtor: but because He is just and good, He must approve such good work, though it be done in mortal sin, and so give grace for such service. But when grace is obtained, God is become a

¹ Primo quæritur, an justificatio impii sit remissio peccatorum? Et videtur quod non. . . . Sed contra est quod dicitur in Glossa, Rom. viii. Super illud 'Quos vocavit, hos et justificavit.' Glo. remissione peccatorum; ergo remissio peccatorum est justificatio.—Aquinas *Quæstion. Disput. quæst. 28, Art. 1.* quoted by Laurence, *Bampt. Lect.* p. 347.

debtor, and is constrained of right and duty to give eternal life. For now it is not only a work of free-will, done according to the substance, but also done in grace, which makes a man acceptable to God, that is to say, in charity.' 'This is the divinity of the kingdom of antichrist; which here I recite that St. Paul's argument may be the better understood; for two things contrary to one another being put together may be the better understood¹.'

Again, the compunction for sin which might be felt before the grace of God was given was called *attrition*; compunction arising from the motions of God's Spirit being called *contrition*. Now attrition was considered as a means whereby God predisposed to grace. So that it had in it some merit *de congruo*, and so of its own nature led to contrition and to justification².

There being some difficulty in knowing whether a man's repentance was *contrition* or merely *attrition*, the Church was supposed to come to his aid with the power of the keys. The sacrament of penance added to attrition, and works of satisfaction being enjoined, the conscience was to be stilled, though it might yet be uncertain, whether true repentance and lively faith had really been attained³.

Once more, the doctrine that the sacraments worked grace and so effected justification independently of the faith of the receiver, and merely *ex opere operato*, was by the reformers charged upon the schoolmen as overthrowing the doctrine of

¹ Luther, on Galatians ii. 16.

² See Laurence, *B. L.* Lect. iv. and vi. Also notes on Lect. vi. The following is one sentence from a long passage quoted by him, p. 348, from Scotus, Lib. iv. dist. iv. quæst. 2.

'Potest ergo dici quod Deus disponit per attritionem, in aliquo instanti dare gratiam: et pro illa attritione, ut pro merito, justificat, sicut est meritum justificationis. Et licet non continuaretur idem actus circa peccatum in genere naturæ et moris, qui prius, adhuc in illo instanti infunderetur gratia, qui jam præcepit meritum de congruo.'

³ Laurence, as above, and notes, pp. 350, 355, 356.

justification, through faith, by the merits of Christ¹. And at last when by attrition perfected by penance, satisfaction, and absolution, and through the grace of God passing into contrition, the sinner was believed to be pardoned, and his soul justified before God, it still remained a question whether there was not a certain amount of temporal punishment to be endured in this life, perhaps, but more probably in purgatory, before the soul could be received into full favour with God, and be pronounced 'not guilty' in His presence.

The abuses which prevailed at the time of the Reformation connected with the above doctrines are popularly known. Hence, especially, the merit attached to pilgrimages, and other works of satisfaction, which were thought capable of averting the temporal punishments yet due to sin; although, of course, eternal punishment could be averted only by the merits of Christ. Hence, too, the famous sale of indulgences, which first prompted Luther to take the steps which led rapidly to his breach with the see of Rome.

It is possible that much of the teaching of the schoolmen, and of the more learned and pious of the divines of the middle ages, may, when fairly interpreted, admit of a sense far more innocent than we are apt to attribute to it, and might, if confined to the schools, have produced comparatively little mischief. But the effect produced upon the popular mind was evidently noxious. Nothing can be more plain than the fact that reformers, in all countries, felt that the great evil against which they had to fight, was the general belief that man could merit God's favour by good deeds of his own, and that works of mercy, charity, and self-denial, procured (through the intercession of Christ, or perhaps of the Virgin Mary) pardon for sin and acceptance with God.

It was in opposition to all this that Luther so strongly propounded his doctrine of 'justification by faith only.' He saw the extreme importance of teaching men to acknowledge their

¹ Laurence, pp. 354, 368.

own weakness, and to rely on the Atonement, 'as a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world.' Salvation was to be ascribed to grace, not to be claimed as a right; and with the view of effectually destroying all hope from *claims*, he adopted the language of St. Paul, and put forth in its strongest possible form, as the *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiae*, the statement that 'justification is by faith only,' without works, love, or holiness. That is to say, he asserted that man is justified through, or because of the merits of Christ, and that the sole *instrument* of his justification is *faith*. This faith indeed will produce charity, and so good works: but, when considered as justifying, it must be considered as apart from holiness, and charity, and good works.

The vehemence of his temper, and the great importance which he attached to his doctrine, led him to state it in language which we may not approve. Such language, if used now, when very different errors prevail from those most common in Luther's time, might, in all probability, lead to Antinomianism and fanaticism of all kinds. But it is necessary to put ourselves into Luther's position, and to take a fair view of the man, whose energy brought about the greatest revolution in history, in order to judge fairly of his language and opinions.

For example, Luther stated that faith alone, not faith informed or perfected by charity, was that which justified. This seems opposed to the language of St. James (ch. ii. 14, &c.), and even to the language of St. Paul, who tells us, that it is 'faith, which worketh by love,' which 'availeth in Christ Jesus' (Gal. v. 6). Accordingly, the schoolmen had distinguished between *fides informis*, a faith which was merely speculative, and had in it neither love nor holiness, and *fides formata*, or faith which is perfected by the charity and good works, which spring from it; to which faith they attributed the office of justifying¹.

¹ On this scholastic distinction see Calvin, *Instit.* Lib. iii. c. ii. § 8.

Now this statement, that it is *fides formata*, which justifies, Luther denied. By so doing it will be thought by many that he contradicted Scripture, the fathers, the homilies of our own Church, and the sentiments of many contemporary reformers. But the ground on which he did so he himself clearly explains to us. The schoolmen and Romanist divines, according to him, taught that faith, furnished with charity, justified the sinner, in order that they might assign the office of justification, not to the faith, but to the charity; that so it might be said, Faith justifies indeed; but it is because of the merit of that charity, and of those good works which it contains, and which give it all its efficacy. 'Faith,' he says, is, according to them, 'the body and the shell; charity the life, the kernel, the form, and furniture.' 'But we,' he continues, 'in the stead of this charity, put faith, and we say, that faith apprehends Jesus Christ, who is the form which adorns and furnishes faith....As the schoolmen say, that charity adorns and furnishes faith; so do we say, that it is Christ which furnishes or adorns faith, or rather, that He is the very form and perfection of faith. Wherefore Christ apprehended by faith and dwelling in the heart is the true Christian righteousness, for which God counteth us righteous, and giveth us eternal life¹.'

Faith then, he taught, will justify, not because it is full of love, but because it is full of Christ. Therefore, too, he thought it necessary to state, that faith justified before it had charity or good works with it; though, of necessity, it must produce charity and good works as soon as it has justified. Faith he compares to the bride, Christ to the bridegroom. The bride will be alone with the Bridegroom, but as soon as she cometh

Calvin himself denies the justice of the distinction on this ground: *Fides in Christi notitia sita est. Christus nisi cum Spiritus sui sanctificatione cognosci nequit. Consequitur fidem a pio affectu nullo modo esse distrahendum.* A very different argument from Luther's.

¹ Luther on Galat. ii. 16. See also on Gal. ii. 17; v. 16.

forth from the bridechamber, she will be attended by her bridesmaids and followers, good works and holiness.

The earnestness with which he pursued his object, and the infinite importance which he attached to it, led him into vehemence of expressions, and perhaps inaccuracy of statements, which only the circumstances of the case can extenuate. At times he seems to speak as if faith itself was the cause, not merely the instrument, of salvation. At other times he writes as if good works were rather to be avoided than desired. But it is fair to consider these expressions as the result of inadvertence and the impetuosity with which he pleaded a favourite cause, when we find statements of the evil of Antinomianism, and the excellency of those works which spring from faith, in other portions of the very same writings¹.

It should be added, that Luther plainly put forth the statement that the sins of the believer are imputed to Christ, and so that Christ's righteousness is imputed to the believer². He speaks often of the desirableness of attaining to personal assurance of salvation, and at times appears to identify this assurance with justifying faith³.

The Council of Trent was much occupied in discussing Luther's doctrine of justification. Indeed the Tridentine fathers

¹ For example, on Gal. iii. 22: 'When we are out of the matter of justification, we cannot enough praise and extol those works which God has commanded. For who can enough commend the profit and fruit of only one work, which a christian does in and through faith? Indeed it is more precious than heaven and earth.' See also on Gal. iii. 19, 23, 27, &c.

² See on Gal. ii. 16; iii. 13.

³ See on Gal. iii. 13. *Opera*, fol. 1554. Tom. v. p. 350. Concerning Luther's view of the connexion of justification with baptism, we may refer to his commentary on Gal. iii. 27, Tom. v. p. 369. There he says, 'We have by nature the leathern coat of Adam, but we put on Christ by baptism.' In Baptismo non datur vestitus legalis justitiæ aut nostrorum operum, sed Christus fit indumentum nostrum.... Evangelice Christum induere, non est legem et opera, sed inæstimabile donum induere, scilicet remissionem peccatorum, justitiam, pacem, consolationem, lætitiâ in

appear to have gone to the consideration of it with the conviction that all his errors might be resolved into this one¹.

It was universally agreed among these divines that faith justifies. But what justifying faith was, or how it justified, was much debated. 'All agreed that justifying faith is an assent to whatsoever is revealed by God, or determined by the Church to be believed; which, sometimes being joined with charity, sometimes remaining without it, they distinguished into two sorts: one which is found in sinners, which the schools call unformed, solitary, idle, or dead; the other, which is only in the good, working by charity, and therefore called formed, efficacious, and lively.' But it was not universally agreed that justifying faith was to be called faith formed by charity; Marinarius, a Carmelite, objecting that St. Paul did not say faith was formed by charity, but that it worketh by charity².

There was much discussion concerning works before grace, and merit *de congruo*, in which the Franciscans maintained, whilst the Dominicans denied, that good works could be done without the Spirit of God, and so merit grace of congruity³. But concerning works after grace, all agreed to condemn Luther, who denied intrinsic goodness to works done in and after grace, and asserted even that they were sins. These, they all asserted, having been wrought by the Spirit of God, were essentially good, and perfect⁴. They all agreed too, that only faith could not be said to justify, since God and the sacraments do justify, as causes in their several kinds⁵.

But the principal points of the difficulty were: first, Is a man justified, and then acts justly? or, Does he act justly, and then is justified? and, secondly, Is the word 'justify' to be used in the forensic sense of imputing righteous; or does it mean

Spiritu Sancto, salutem, vitam, et Christum ipsum. See also *De Sacr. Baptism.* Tom. i. p. 72.

¹ Sarpi, *Hist. Lib.* ii. p. 178.

² p. 183.

³ p. 185.

⁴ p. 186.

⁵ p. 183.

infusion of habitual righteousness into the heart? On the latter point there was much difference of opinion; the Franciscans strongly opposing the forensic sense, which was as strongly upheld by Marinarus. None doubted that Christ had merited for us, but some blamed the word to *impute*, because it was not found in the fathers; whilst others said that, agreeing on the thing, it was needless to dispute about the word; a word which it appears the Dominicans especially would have accepted, as shewing that all was from Christ, but that they suspected any word which was popular with the Lutherans¹.

After many such discussions as these, the Council finally drew up sixteen heads and thirty anathemas on the subject of justification, yet so guarded and obscure, that each party wrote treatises to prove that the decisions were in their favour². The most important of the decrees were the following: (2) That God sent His Son to redeem both Jews and Gentiles. (3) But that though He died for all, yet those only enjoy the benefit to whom His merit is communicated. (4) That the justification of the wicked is a translation from the state of a son of Adam, to that of a son of God, which, since the Gospel, is not done without baptism or the vow thereof. (5) That the beginning of justification in adults proceeds from preventing grace. (7) That justification is *not only remission of sins, but sanctification* also; and has five causes; the final, God's glory and eternal life; the efficient, God; the meritorious, Christ; the instrumental, the sacraments; and the formal, righteousness, given by God, received according to the good pleasure of the Holy Ghost, and according to the disposition of the receiver, receiving together with remission of sins, faith, hope, and charity. (8) That when St. Paul saith that man is justified by faith and *gratis*, it ought to be understood, because faith is the beginning, and the things which precede justification are not meritorious of grace.

¹ p. 187.

² p. 202.

Among the *anathemas*, some of the most important are :
 (1) That a man may be justified without grace. (11) That man is justified only by the imputation of the justice of Christ, or only by remission of sins without inherent grace, or charity ; or that the grace of justification is only the favour of God. (12) That justifying faith is nothing but confidence in the mercy of God, who remitteth sins for Christ. (14) That man is absolved and justified because he doth firmly believe that he is justified.

These articles and anathemas shew the difference between Luther and the Council of Trent, so far as we can be certain of the design of the latter. Yet the most eminent divines present in the Council, after its decrees, debated on their sense¹, so that at last it was necessary to make a decree against all notes, glosses, and commentaries ; the Pope reserving to himself the right of solving difficulties, and settling controversies on the subject².

Roman Catholic writers since the Reformation have generally gone against the forensic sense of the word ‘justify :’ have held that God by grace implants inherent righteousness in the heart, makes the sinner righteous by union with Christ and the indwelling of His Spirit, and that then He esteems him, what in fact He has made him, a holy and righteous man. Their view has been thus stated by one, who may be supposed to have carefully studied it, ‘It appears that they hold two things :—that the presence of grace implies the absence of mortal sin ; next, that it is a divine gift bringing with it the property of a continual acceptableness, and so recommending the soul to God’s favour, so as to anticipate the necessity of any superadded pardon³.’

¹ Sarpi, Bk. II. p. 215.

² Sarpi, Bk. VIII. p. 762.

³ Newman, *On Justification*, p. 396. See also Bellarmine, *De Justific.* ; and Barrow, Vol. II. Sect. v. p. 79.

Bellarmino states the causes of justification thus : 1. *The final cause*, God’s glory and our salvation. 2. *The efficient cause*, God’s goodness and Christ’s merits. 3. *The material cause*, the mind or will of man, in which

To return to the Lutheran divines; Melancthon, the Confession of Augsburg, and generally the more moderate Lutherans, softened and explained the strong language of Luther. With them Faith was trust (*fiducia*), or fiduciary apprehension. It was made clear that faith in itself had no virtue, but that the meritorious cause of justification was the death and satisfaction of Jesus Christ. So that justification by faith was even said to be a *correlative* term for justification or salvation by the merits and death of Christ. Nay, justification by faith was even called a *Paulina figura*, by which was meant that we are saved by grace, and not by claims or merits of our own¹.

righteousness abides and in which are formed the dispositions predisposing to the formal cause. 4. *The formal cause*, internally, the habit of grace; externally, the righteousness of Christ. *De Justific.* Lib. i. cap. 2. Justification he denies to consist in remission of sins or imputation of righteousness only, but to have for its formal cause the infusion of habitual righteousness. Lib. ii. cap. 3, 6, 15. Good works he asserts to be meritorious of eternal life, but that, because they are wrought in us by the grace of God. Lib. v. cap. 12, *et passim*.

¹ Fide sumus justi, id est, per misericordiam propter Christum sumus justi; non quia fides sit virtus, quæ mereatur remissionem sua dignitate.—Melancth. *Loci Theolog. de Argum. Advers.* p. 284. Laurence, *B. L.* p. 367.

Cum dicitur, Fide justificamur, non aliud dicitur, quam quod propter Filium Dei accipiamus remissionem peccatorum et reputemur justi.... Intelligatur ergo propositio *correlative*, Fide justi sumus, id est, per misericordiam propter Filium Dei sumus justi seu accepti.—Mel. *Loc. Theol. de Voc. Fidei*, f. 199. 2. Newman, *On Justif.* p. 278.

Cum igitur dicimus *Fide justificamur*, non hoc intelligimus, quod justi sumus propter ipsius virtutis dignitatem, sed hæc est sententia, consequi nos remissionem peccatorum, et imputationem justitiæ per misericordiam propter Christum.... Jam bonas mentes nihil offendet *novitas hujus Paulinæ figuræ*, *Fide justificamur*, si intelligant proprie de misericordia dici, eamque veris et necessariis laudibus ornari. Quid potest enim esse gratius conscientiae afflictæ et pavidæ in veris doloribus quam audire, hoc esse mandatum Dei, hanc esse vocem sponsi Christi, ut statuant certe donari remissionem peccatorum seu reconciliationem, non propter nostram dignitatem, sed gratis, per misericordiam, propter Christum, ut beneficium sit certum.—Confessio August. 1540. *De Fide, Sylloge Confessionem*, Oxf. 1827, p. 182.

Thus then it was ruled, that the peculiar significance of St. Paul's language, and of the Lutheran use of it, implied, not an opposition of faith to charity, or of faith to holiness, but an opposition of the merits of Christ to the merits of man, of the mercy of God to the claims which a sinner might suppose himself to have for acceptance in God's presence.

Still it was clear that, in some sense, *faith* was made the *instrument* or *formal* cause of justification. And the question still remained, Had such faith love in it, or was it to be considered as apart from love? We have seen that Luther declared that justifying faith had not love in it, till it had justified; and to his definitions some of the Lutherans adhered, though he may himself afterwards have in some degree modified them.

Melancthon and the moderate Lutherans appear to have spoken rather differently. Melancthon says that 'no doubt there is love and other graces in faith; but that when St. Paul says, "we are justified by faith," he means not by the virtue of that grace, but by the mercy of God, for the sake of the Mediator¹.' The Confession of Augsburg declares that 'faith cannot exist except in those who repent;' that 'among good works, the chief is faith, which produces many other virtues, which cannot exist till faith has been conceived in the heart².' Again, it reconciles St. James and St. Paul, by explaining that St. James speaks of a mere historical faith, whilst St. Paul

¹ Concedo in fiducia inesse dilectionem, et hanc virtutem et plerasque alias adesse oportere; sed cum dicimus, Fiducia sumus justi, non intelligatur nos propter virtutis istius dignitatem, sed per misericordiam recipi propter Mediatorem, quem tamen oportet fide apprehendi. Ergo hoc dicimus correlative.—Melancth. *Loc. Comm.* f. 213; Laurence, *B. L.* p. 367; Newm. *Justific.* p. 10.

² Nec existere fides potest nisi in his qui poenitentiam agunt, quia fides consolatur corda in contritione et terroribus peccati.... Inter bona opera, præcipuum est et summus cultus Dei fides ipsa, et parit multas alias virtutes, quæ existere non possunt, nisi prius corda fidem conceperint.—*Confess. August. Syll. Conf.* p. 83.

speaks of reliance on God's mercy in Christ¹. It distinctly asserts that faith brings forth good works, and quotes with approbation the words of St. Ambrose, *Fides bonæ voluntatis et justæ actionis genitrix est*². All then, but a few of the more rigid Lutherans, agreed that it was a living, not a dead faith, a faith full of good works, not a bare and historical assent to truth, which justified the soul. Still, the question remained, Was it *fides, quæ viva est*, or, *fides qua viva est*, (i. e. faith, which is living, or faith, because it is living) which justifies? Some thought that, if it were considered as justifying because it was living, then there would be some merit attached to that which quickened it, or which shewed it to be alive, i. e. to charity. Modes were invented of explaining the difficulty, which savoured more of metaphysical subtlety than of practical wisdom, such as that mentioned by Bishop Bull: 'Faith justifies, pregnant with good works, but not as yet having given birth to them³.'

Bucer, a divine who had some concern in our own Reformation, and whose opinions are therefore particularly interesting to us, seems to have been very moderate on this subject. He expresses his regret that language should be used concerning faith alone, to the exclusion of holiness, such as to offend well-meaning men. He considers that no one should object to the additions of *viva* or *formata* as applied to justifying faith; since it is plain that St. Paul spoke of a living faith as justifying, and only meant to exclude self-righteousness⁴.

Several controversies concerning justification arose among the Lutherans even in the lifetime of Luther. Osiander, A.D. 1550, broached some opinions, the exact nature of which it may be difficult to define. They appear to have been chiefly 'that

¹ *Sylloge, Conf.* pp. 181, 182.

² *Ibid.* p. 183.

³ Bull, *Harm. Apostol.* Diss. Prior. vi. 2.

⁴ See especially on Psalm xi. quoted by Bull, *Harm. Apost.* Diss. Post. ii. 8.

faith does not justify by applying and embracing the righteousness of the Man Christ, but by uniting to Christ, who then by His Divine nature dwells in the heart, and that this union both justifies before God, and sanctifies the sinner.' There was probably, however, something more than this, or it would hardly have excited the vehement opposition of so mild a man as Melancthon¹.

Of a very different kind were the errors of Agricola, (A.D. 1538) who is accused of having carried the doctrine of *faith alone* to its most noxious extreme. He is esteemed the founder of the Antinomians; and is said to have held that all licentiousness and sin were allowable, if only Christ was received and embraced by a lively faith. He was vigorously opposed by Luther².

To proceed from the Lutheran to the Calvinistic reformers, they appear for the most part to have symbolized with Luther in his general statement concerning justification. They declared that *to justify* was a forensic term signifying to *remit sins*, and pronounce *righteous*³. They said that we received this justification not by works, but by faith in God's mercy; and because faith receives Christ, our righteousness, and ascribes all to God's grace in Christ, therefore justification is attributed to faith, and that, chiefly because of Christ, not because it is any work of ours⁴. They considered it to consist especially in the imputation of our sins to Christ, and of Christ's righteousness to us; and strenuously denied that justification was in conse-

¹ Mosh. *Ch. Hist.* Art. xvi. § iii. part ii. See also Calvin, *Instit.* iii. Cap. xi. 5—11, who accuses him of opinions bordering on Manicheism.

² Mosh. as above.

³ *Justificatio significat Apostolo in disputatione de Justificatione, peccata remittere, a culpa et pœna absolvere, in gratiam recipere, et justum pronunciare.*—*Confess. Helvet. Sylloge*, p. 51.

Nos justificationem simpliciter interpretamur acceptionem, qua nos Deus in gratiam receptos pro justis habet.—Calvin. *Inst.* iii. xi. 2.

⁴ *Sylloge*, p. 52.

quence of any internal sanctification wrought in us by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, and the faith which He inspires¹. They denied that justification was of faith and works conjoined². But when the question arose, Is the faith which justifies to be considered as alone, and *informis*, or lively, and full of good works, (*formata*)? they seem to have decided that it was the latter, and not the former. Although Calvin complained that the distinction was nugatory, inasmuch as faith never could exist apart from the holiness which it produces³.

Our own reformers soon embraced the doctrine of Luther, with such modifications as their own wisdom suggested. In the Articles set forth in 1536, justification is defined to signify remission of sins and acceptance into the favour of God. We are said to attain this justification for the only mercy and grace of the Father, freely for Jesus Christ's sake, through contrition and faith joined with charity⁴; language which is repeated in the *Institution of a Christian Man*⁵.

¹ Deus nos justificat non imputans nobis peccata, sed imputans Christi nobis justitiam. *Sylloge*, p. 52.

Hinc et illud conficitur, sola intercessione justitiæ Christi nos obtinere ut coram Deo justificemur. Quod perinde valet ac si diceretur hominem non in seipso justum esse, sed quia Christi justitia imputatione cum illo communicatur: quod accurata animadversione dignum est. Siquidem evanescit nugamentum illud, ideo justificari hominem fide, quoniam illa Spiritum Dei participat quo justus redditur: quod magis est contrarium superiori doctrinæ quam ut conciliari unquam queat. Neque enim dubium, quin sit inops propriæ justitiæ, qui justitiam extra seipsum quærere docetur.—Calv. *Inst.* III. xi. 23.

² Calv. *Inst.* III. xi. 13, 14.

³ Quapropter loquimur in hac causa, non de ficta fide, de inani et otiosa et mortua, sed de viva, vivificanteque, quæ propter Christum, qui vita est et vivificat, quem comprehendit, viva est et dicitur, ac se vivam esse vivis declarat operibus. Nihil itaque contra hanc nostram doctrinam pugnat Jacobus ille, qui de fide loquitur inani et mortua, quam quidam jactabant, Christum autem intra se viventem per fidem non habebant.—*Confess. Helvet. Sylloge*, p. 53. See also Calvin, *Inst.* III. ii. 8, quoted above.

⁴ *Formularies of Faith in the Reign of Henry VIII.* Oxford, p. 12.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 209.

As on other subjects, the English reformers' views grew more fixed and definite after the death of Henry VIII. The Homily of Salvation and the 11th Article of 1552 expressed definitively the judgment of Cranmer and his companions on justification. The 11th Article, as drawn by them, ran thus: 'Justification by only faith in Jesus Christ, in that sense as it is declared in the Homily of Justification, is a most certain and wholesome doctrine for Christian men.' The Article, as it stands now, is somewhat differently worded, but probably conveys the same sense. Both send us to the 'Homily of Justification,' as the interpreter of the sense in which the Church of England understands 'Justification by faith;' and therefore the definitions of this homily, if we can discover them, are the definitions of the Anglican Church concerning this debated point. There is no homily entitled the Homily of Justification, but the Homily of Salvation treats expressly of justification; and it has therefore always been understood either that this homily alone (or this conjoined with that which precedes, and that which follows it) is the homily referred to in the Article.

The Article itself, as it now stands, appears to speak very much the language of Melancthon and the Confession of Augsburg; for its statement of the doctrine of justification by faith is that, 'We are accounted righteous before God only for the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings.' This is language very similar to that of Melancthon, quoted above, who considered justification by faith, and salvation by grace, to be correlative terms; and to that of the Confession of Augsburg, which calls justification by faith a *Paulina figura* for remission of sins by mercy, for the sake of Christ. For further explanation the Article sends us to the homily, which teaches as follows.

It begins by defining justification to be 'the forgiveness of sins and trespasses.' 'This justification or righteousness, which we so receive of God's mercy and Christ's merits, embraced by

faith, is taken, allowed, and accepted for our perfect and full justification....God sent His Son into the world to fulfil the Law for us, and by shedding of His most precious Blood, to make a sacrifice and satisfaction, or (as it may be called) amends to His Father for our sins, to assuage His wrath and indignation conceived against us for the same. Insomuch that infants, being baptized and dying in their infancy, are by this sacrifice washed from their sins, brought to God's favour, and made His children, and inheritors of His Kingdom of Heaven. And they, which in act or deed, do sin after baptism, when they turn again to God unfeignedly, they are likewise washed by this sacrifice from their sins, in such sort that there remaineth not any spot of sin that shall be imputed to their damnation. This is that justification of righteousness, which St. Paul speaketh of, when he saith, *No man is justified by the works of the law, but freely, by faith in Jesus Christ.* Gal. ii....The Apostle toucheth specially three things, which must go together in our justification. Upon God's part, His great mercy and grace: upon Christ's part, justice, that is the satisfaction of God's justice....upon our part, true and lively faith in the merits of Jesus Christ, which yet is not ours, but God's working in us....Therefore St. Paul declareth here nothing upon the behalf of man concerning his justification, but only a true and lively faith, which nevertheless is the gift of God, and not man's only work without God. And yet that faith doth not shut out repentance, hope, love, dread and the fear of God, to be joined with faith, in every man that is justified, but it shutteth them out from the office of justifying. So that, although they be all present together in him that is justified, yet they justify not altogether: nor the faith also doth not shut out the justice of our good works, necessarily to be done afterwards of duty towards God: (for we are most bounden to serve God in doing good deeds, commanded by Him in His holy Scripture, all the days of our

How it is to be understood that faith justifieth without works.

life :) but it excludeth them, so that we may not do them to this intent, to be made just by doing of them¹.'

Again—'The true understanding of the doctrine, we be justified freely by faith without works, or that we be justified by faith in Christ only, is not, that this our own act to believe in Christ, or this our faith in Christ, which is within us, doth justify us, and deserve our justification unto us (for that were to count ourselves to be justified by some act or virtue which is within ourselves;) but the true understanding and meaning thereof is, that although we hear God's word, and believe it; although we have faith, hope, charity, repentance, dread, and fear of God within us, and do never so many good works thereunto; yet we must renounce the merit of all said virtues, of faith, hope, charity, and all other virtues and good deeds, which we either have done, shall do, or can do, as things that be far too weak and insufficient and imperfect, to deserve remission of our sins and our justification; and therefore we must trust only in God's mercy, and that sacrifice which our High Priest and Saviour Jesus Christ, the Son of God, once offered for us upon the cross, to obtain thereby God's grace and remission, as well of our original sin in baptism, as of all actual sin committed by us after our baptism, if we truly repent and turn unfeignedly to Him again. So that as St John the Baptist, although he was never so virtuous and godly a man, yet in this matter of forgiveness of sin, he did put the people from him, and appointed them to Christ, saying thus unto them: *Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world*, John i.; even so, as great and godly a virtue as the lively faith is, yet it putteth us from itself, and remitteth or appointeth us unto Christ, for to have only by Him remission of our sins, or justification. So that our faith in Christ (as it were) saith unto us thus: It is not I that take away your sins, but

¹ First Part of the *Homily of Salvation*.

it is Christ only; and to Him only I send you for that purpose, forsaking therein all your good virtues, words, thoughts, and works, and only putting your trust in Christ¹.'

It is plain that the doctrine contained in these extracts, (from a homily, which has unusual authority, as being virtually assented to by every one who signs the Articles) is briefly as follows. That which the English reformers meant by justification by faith, is, that we can never deserve any thing at God's hands by our own works—that therefore we must owe our salvation only to the free mercy of God, who, for the sake of His Son Jesus Christ, pardons and accepts all infants who are baptized in His name, and all persons who sin after baptism, when by His grace they are brought again to repentance—that justification is especially assigned to faith, not because of any peculiar excellence in faith itself, but rather because faith sends us from itself to Christ—that, though therefore we ascribe justification to faith only, it is not meant that justifying faith either is or can be without its fruits, but that it is ever pregnant and adorned with love, and hope, and holiness.

Language in strict conformity with this was uniformly held by those who had the chief hand in drawing up the Articles and compiling the Liturgy, and is to be found in those semi-authoritative documents which were from time to time set forth by them².

¹ Second Part of *Homily of Salvation*. Also concerning the difference between a dead and living faith, and the reconciliation of St. Paul and St. James, see Part 3. See also the conclusion of the 3rd part of the *Homily on Prayer*; the second part of the *Homily on Almsdeeds*, near the middle; the conclusion of the second *Homily of the Passion*, and particularly the whole of the *Homilies of Faith and Good Works*.

² We may refer particularly to the following:—Cranmer's Catechism, Oxf. pp. 98, 114, 115, 143, 205; Cranmer's *Works*, ed. Jenkins, Oxf. Vol. II. p. 121, III. 553; Ridley on Ephesians ii. 9; on Phil. ii. 13, iii. 9, 12, 18.

Justification is thus briefly explained in Edw. VI.'s Catechism: 'As oft as we use to say that we are made righteous and saved by faith only; it

Owing to the unhappy divisions of later times in the Church of England, there has been no small difference among her divines on this head of justification; a difference, however, which there is good reason to think is rather apparent in scholastic and logical definitions, than in its bearing on vital truth or practical godliness.

The great Hooker wrote a treatise on Justification, in which he strongly impugns the doctrine of the Church of Rome concerning justification by infusion of righteousness, and maintains the principle of imputation, distinguishing the righteous-

is meant thereby, that faith or rather trust alone, doth lay hand upon, understand, and perceive our righteous making to be given us of God freely: that is to say, by no deserts of our own, but by the free grace of the Almighty Father. Moreover, faith doth engender in us the love of our neighbour, and such works as God is pleased withal. For if it be a true and lively faith, quickened by the Holy Ghost, she is the mother of all good saying and doing....And although good works cannot deserve to make us righteous before God, yet do they so cleave unto faith, that neither can faith be found without them, nor good works be anywhere without faith.'—(*Enchiridion Theolog.* Vol. i. p. 25.)

So Noel's Catechism: Ad Dei misericordiam confugiendum est qua gratis nos in Christo nullo nostro merito nec operum respectu, amore et benevolentia complectitur; tum peccata nobis nostra condonans, tum justitia Christi per Fidem in ipsum ita nos donans ut ob eam, perinde ac si nostra esset, ipsi accepti simus....*M.* Non ergo inter hujus justitiæ causas Fidem principem locum tenere dicis, ut ejus merito nos ex nobis justi coram Deo habeamur? *A.* Nequaquam: id enim esset Fidem in Christi locum substituere....*M.* Verum an a bonis operibus ita separari hæc justitia potest, ut qui hunc habet, illis careat? *A.* Nequaquam....*M.* Justitiam ergo, Fidem, ac bona opera, natura coherentia esse dicis, quæ proinde non magis distrahi debeant, quam Christus illorum in nobis author, a seipso divelli possit.—*Enchirid. Theolog.* Vol. i. p. 280.

Jewell's *Apology*: Itaque unicum receptum nostrum et perfugium esse ad misericordiam Patris nostri per Jesum Christum, ut certo animis nostris persuadeamus illum esse propitiationem pro peccatis nostris; ejus sanguine omnes labeas nostras deletas esse....Quamvis autem dicamus nihil nobis esse præsidii in operibus et factis nostris, et omnis salutis nostræ rationem constituamus in solo Christo, non tamen ea causa dicimus laxæ et salutis vivendum esse, quasi tingi tantum et credere, satis sit homini Christiano, et nihil ab eo aliud expectetur. Vera Fides viva est, nec potest esse otiosa.—*Enchirid. Theolog.* pp. 131, 132.

ness of justification as external to us, the righteousness of sanctification as internal¹.

Bishop Bull in his *Harmonia Apostolica* admits that sense of justification by faith which he says all the sounder Protestants have attached to it, viz. Salvation by grace only. He takes justification in the forensic sense, the meritorious cause of which is Christ, the instrument or formal cause being *fides formata*, or faith accompanied by good works².

Dr. Barrow, in the first five of his Sermons on the Creed, discusses the nature of faith and justification with great learning and moderation. Justification he shews to be a forensic term, to be given for the sake of Christ, to be the result of God's mere mercy, apart from our deserts; yet he considers baptism and faith to be the conditions of justification, and faith to include its effects. Faith is a hearty reception of the Gospel, first exerting itself by open avowal in baptism, to which time therefore the act of justification especially pertains. Yet also every dispensation of pardon granted upon repentance may be also termed justification. Hence every person is justified freely for Christ's sake at his baptism, continues justified whilst he is in a state of lively faith, and returns to a state of justification, if he have fallen from it, by repentance³.

Dr. Waterland, in a most valuable tract on the same subject, argues that the causes of justification are, (1) the moving cause, God's grace and goodness; (2) the meritorious cause, Christ; (3) the efficient cause, the Holy Spirit—that its instruments are, (1) baptism; (2) faith—that its conditions are, (1) faith; (2) obedience⁴.

Mr Alexander Knox, a writer of great originality and piety,

¹ *Discourse on Justification, &c. Works*, Vol. III. part II. p. 601. Oxf. 1836.

² Bull's *Harm Apost. and Examen. Censuræ. Works*, Oxf. Vol. III. IV.

³ *Works*, fol. Vol. II. especially Sermons IV. V.

⁴ Waterland, *On Justification, Works*, Van Mildert, Vol. IX. p. 427.

expressed himself unable to believe the protestant doctrine of justification. The forensic sense of the word seemed to him too like a legal fiction: and he could not believe that God could pronounce any one just, or account any one righteous, who had really no such inherent quality as justice or righteousness. Accordingly he solved the difficulty by asserting, that God pronounces those righteous by justification whom He has already made so by sanctification¹.

In still later days, Mr. Faber has written an able work to prove that in the earliest Christian writers, from Clement of Rome downwards, the word justification is used strictly in its forensic sense, and is ascribed to faith alone².

Lastly, not very long before his secession to the Church of Rome, Mr. Newman published a most logical treatise, in which he professes to steer a middle course between the Roman and the Lutheran doctrines. He takes the forensic sense of the term justification—and asserts that it is conferred in baptism, is maintained by faith, and consists in the indwelling of the Spirit of God, and the being made members of the Body of Christ³.

Whatever speculative differences may have existed of late or in times gone by, it is no small comfort to know, that it has been allowed by all, that fallen man cannot of himself become worthy of eternal salvation, that he stands in need both of pardoning mercy and sanctifying grace, that this mercy and this grace have been procured for him by the all-prevailing merits of the Redeemer, and that these blessings offered to all, may be appropriated to the individual believer by that faith, which the Holy Spirit will implant, and which must produce love and holiness and all good fruits. The divines of Trent and their most extreme antagonists have denied none of these propositions.

¹ Knox's *Remains*.

² Faber's *Primitive Doctrine of Justification*.

³ Newman, *On Justification*: see especially Lect. III. VI. IX.

SECTION II.

SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

I. SENSE of the word *Justification*.

The word which we render *just* or *righteous* (viz. *δίκαιος*, or in the Hebrew *צַדִּיק*) has two principal significations: the one popular, the other accurate. In its popular signification, it is nearly equivalent to *good*, *holy*, *pious*, (*ἀγαθος*, *εὐσεβής*, *צַדִּיק*); and is used commonly of men who are living a pious and upright life, not according to the perfect standard of the law of God, but subject to such imperfection and impurity as is common to man. Examples of this usage may be found in the following, among many other passages: Gen. vi. 9. Ps. xxxvii. 12. Prov. iv. 18; xxiv. 16. Matt. i. 19; x. 41; xxiii. 29. Mark vi. 20. Luke ii. 25. Acts x. 22. James v. 16. In its more accurate sense, *δίκαιος* signifies absolutely, strictly, and perfectly righteous or just, without defect or impurity, like the holy Angels, or like God Himself. As for instance, in Job ix. 2. Matt. xxvii. 19. Luke xxiii. 47. Rom. ii. 13; iii. 10. 1 Tim. i. 9. In which, as in most similar passages, the word particularly seems to express *innocent*, *not guilty*, with reference to a tribunal of justice, or question of crime. The same distinction is equally observable in the substantive *righteousness* (*צַדִּיק דִּיקַּיִסוּנָה*); which at one time stands for strict and perfect justice, (as in Acts xvii. 31. Rom. iii. 5. Rev. xix. 11, &c.); at other times for such goodness, holiness, or good deeds, as men under the grace of God are capable of (as in Ps. xv. 2. Isai. xxxii. 17. Matt. v. 10, 20; vi. 33. Acts xiii. 10. Rom. vi. 18, 19, 20; viii. 10; xiv. 17. Eph. v. 9; vi. 14. Heb. xii. 11).

The verb *δικαίω*, which strictly corresponds with the Hebrew causative verb *צַדִּיקָה*, and is translated in English

'to justify,' in some degree partakes of the ambiguity of the adjective from which it is formed; yet, not so as, fairly considered, to introduce much difficulty into the doctrine of which we have to treat.

1 The literal signification of the verb, whether in Hebrew or in Greek, is 'to make righteous.' It may therefore, of course, be used for something like an infusion of righteousness into the mind or character of a man; and the passive may signify the possession of that righteousness so infused; and such a sense appears probably to belong to it in Rev. xxii. 11, 'He that is righteous, let him be righteous still' (ὁ δίκαιος δικαιωθήτω, in some MSS. from a gloss δικαιοσύνην ποιησάτω¹.)

2 But a very slight examination of the question can scarcely fail to convince us that the commoner use of this verb in the Scriptures is in the sense of a judicial sentence; and

(1) It signifies to execute a judicial act, in the general, towards a person, and to do him right, whether in acquitting or in condemning him. Thus in 2 Sam. xv. 4: 'Oh! that I were made a judge in the land, that every man, which hath any suit or cause might come unto me (וְצַדִּיקַי וְכֹל הָעָם וְיִצְדַּק אֶת־אֲנִי וְיִצְדַּק אֶת־כָּל־הָעָם), and I would *justify* him,' that is, do him right.

So Ps. lxxxii. 3: 'Defend the poor and the fatherless, *justify* (וְצַדִּיקוֹם וְיִצְדַּקוֹם) the poor and needy,' i. e. do them right.

(2) Especially it signifies to pronounce sentence in a man's favour, acquit him, free him from punishment. Deut. xxv. 1: 'The judges.... shall justify the righteous, and condemn the wicked.'

¹ The following passages have also been thought to have the word in this sense, but perhaps without sufficient ground: Job xxxv. 7, 8. Ezek. xvi. 52. Eccles. xviii. 22; xxxi. 5.

1 Kings viii. 32. 2 Chron. vi. 23 : 'Then hear Thou in Heaven, and do, and judge Thy servants, condemning the wicked, to bring his way upon his head ; and justifying the righteous, to give him according to his righteousness.'

Prov. xvii. 15 : 'He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are abomination unto the Lord.' So Exod. xxiii. 7. Psalm li. 4.

And so in the new Testament, Matt. xii. 37 : 'By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned,' (*i. e.* in the day of judgment : see ver. 36).

(3) In consequence of this sense of the word *to justify*, it is sometimes used in general for to *approve* or *esteem* a person *just*. So Matt. ix. 19, 'Wisdom is justified of her children.' In Luke x. 29 ; xvi. 15, we read of people who 'justified themselves.' Luke xviii. 14, 'The publican went home *justified*,' (*i. e.* approved either by God or his own conscience) 'rather than the Pharisee.' Luke vii. 29, 'all the people justified God,' (*i. e.* declared their approbation of God's dealings in the mission of John) 'being baptized with John's baptism.'

(4) So again, *to justify* is used for *to free from burdens or obligations*, such as the obligation which a particular law imposes on us, as Rom. vii. 7, 'He that is dead is free from sin' (literally is 'justified,' *δεδικαίωται*).

It appears, then, that in passages where the word 'to justify' occurs with no particular reference to the doctrine of this Article, it is almost always used in a sense more or less connected with the ideas of acquittal, pardon, acceptance, or approbation : *i. e.* in a forensic or judicial sense. It remains to see, whether this is the sense in which St. Paul uses it, when directly and specially treating on justification by faith. Now this will appear, if we consider and compare the following passages. In Rom. v. 9, we read, 'Being *justified by His blood*, we shall be saved from wrath through Him.' With this compare Eph. i. 7, 'In whom we

have redemption through His blood, *the forgiveness of sins.*' Again, if we compare Rom. iii. 24, 25, 26, we cannot fail to conclude that *justification* is a synonym for *remission of sins.* 'Being justified freely by His grace, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness *for the remission of sins* that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, His righteousness, that He might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.'

Then the word *justify* is used as equivalent to *count or impute righteousness* and to *cover sin.* This appears plainly from Rom. iv. 5, 6, 7.

Again, by comparing Rom. v. 9 with Rom. v. 10, it seems that to *justify* is synonymous with to *reconcile with God*; for πολλῶ μᾶλλον δικαιωθέντες, 'much more being justified,' in the one verse, answers to πολλῶ μᾶλλον καταλλάγντες, 'much more being reconciled,' in the other.

Once more, *justification* is directly opposed to *condemnation*, as in Rom. v. 18, 'By the offence of one (judgment came) upon all men to *condemnation*, even so by the righteousness of One, (the free gift came) upon all men unto *justification* of life¹.' Again, in Rom. viii. 33, 34, 'Who shall lay anything to the

¹ It has been argued (Bellarm. *De Justif.* 2, 3, 1, 1) that as Adam's sin was *infused* into his posterity, so this passage must mean that in justification Christ's righteousness is *infused* into His disciples. To which it has been replied (Barrow, Vol. II. Sermon v. p. 80), that justification and condemnation being 'both acts of God, and it being plain that God condemning doth not infuse any inherent unrighteousness into man, neither doth He justifying (formally) (if the antithesis must be *patt*) put any inherent righteousness into him: inherent unrighteousness in the former case may be a consequent of that condemnation, and inherent righteousness may be connected with this justification; but neither *that* nor *this* may formally signify those qualities respectively: as the inherent unrighteousness consequent upon Adam's sin is not included in God's condemning, so neither is the inherent righteousness proceeding from our Saviour's obedience contained in God's justifying men.'

charge of God's elect? It is God that *justifieth*. Who is he that *condemneth*¹?

But, what is more important than the comparison of particular passages, if we consider the whole course of St. Paul's reasoning in the early chapters of the Romans, we must be led to conclude, that by justification he means acquittal from guilt and acceptance with God. He begins by proving that all men, Jews and Gentiles, are *condemned* by the law (whether of Moses or of nature) under which they lived (Rom. i. ii.). He shews from the Law itself that the Jews, as well as the Gentiles, were guilty before God (Rom. iii. 9—19); and that therefore all the world (if the Gospel be not taken into account) are lying under God's wrath and subject to His condemnation. And this course of reasoning leads him to the conclusion, that, if we would have *justification* at all, it must be not by the works of law, but by the faith of Christ (Rom. iii. 20). Now in such a connexion what must justification mean? Man subject to the law (whether revealed or natural) had so much sinned as to be subject to *condemnation*. The thing to be desired was his *justification*; which justification could be only by the free grace of God through Christ. Surely then that *justification* must mean pardon for the sins which he had committed, and deliverance from the condemnation into which his sins had thrown him.

This is further shewn immediately afterwards by the case and the language of saints of the old Testament. Abraham was justified (or, as it is explained, 'accounted righteous') by faith, not by his own good works and deservings. And David looks on a state of blessedness as one in which a man has 'his

¹ The antithesis is not in the least degree altered, if the punctuation and translation of this passage, which has lately been popular, be adopted. Τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν Θεοῦ; Θεὸς ὁ δικαίων; τίς ὁ κατακρίνων; Χριστὸς ὁ ἀποθάνων, κ. τ. λ.; 'Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? Shall God who justifieth? Who is he that condemneth? Is it Christ, who died, &c.?'

iniquities forgiven, and his sins covered' (Rom. iv. 1—8). The thing then, which all the world needed, and which could be obtained only through God's mercy in Christ, was covering of sin, and forgiveness of iniquity. This therefore must be what St. Paul means by the term *Justification*.

II. Sense of the word *Faith*.

Having arrived at a conclusion as to the sense of the words *justify* and *justification*, it becomes necessary, in order to appreciate the meaning of the words *Justification by faith*, and the doctrine expressed by those words, to examine the usages of the term *faith* in Scripture, and especially in the writings of St. Paul.

According to its derivation, the word should mean persuasion of the truth of anything. But this does not decide its force as a theological virtue, still less its signification in the peculiar language of St. Paul. There can be little doubt that it is used in very different senses in different parts of Scripture.

For example :

1 It is used to signify truth or good faith, (like $\pi\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$, *fides*) in Matt. xxiii. 23, 'the weightier matters of the Law, judgment, mercy, and *faith*;' and in Rom. iii. 3: 'Shall their unbelief make the *faith* (or faithfulness) of God without effect?'

2 It is used of the assurance given by one person to another, Acts xvii. 31, 'whereof He hath given *assurance* unto all men' ($\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\omega\nu\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$).

3 It is used as a term to designate the Christian Religion, 'the faith' or 'the faith of Christ.' So Acts vi. 7, 'were obedient to the faith.' Acts xiii. 8, 'seeking to turn away the deputy from the faith.' Rom. i. 5, 'for obedience to the faith among all nations,' $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \upsilon\pi\alpha\kappa\omicron\eta\acute{\nu}\ \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\nu}\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\theta\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota$, (i. e. to convert all nations to the Christian Religion.) So xvi. 26. Comp. Eph. iii. 17; iv. 5. Phil. i. 25. 1 Tim. iv. 1. Tit.

i. 1, 4. James ii. 1. Jude, 3, 20. Rev. ii. 13; xiv. 12. In this sense St. Paul appears especially to use it in his Epistle to the Galatians; where perhaps we may consider that in his constant antithesis of Law and Faith, he is contrasting the Law of Moses, or the Religion of the Jews, with the Faith of Christ, or the Religion of the Gospel. Some of the more obvious usages of the word in this sense in the Epistle to the Galatians are in the following: Gal. i. 23, 'now preacheth the faith which once he destroyed.' iii. 23, 'Before faith came ($\pi\rho\acute{o}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \delta\grave{\epsilon}\ \epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\ \tau\eta\acute{\nu}\ \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$) we were kept under the Law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed' ($\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\eta\acute{\nu}\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\phi\theta\eta\acute{\nu}\alpha\iota\ \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$). The same sense is apparent in the whole context (vv. 24, 25, 26), where it is taught us that both Jews and Gentiles become children of God by the faith (i. e. by embracing the religion or Gospel) of Jesus Christ, having put on Christ by being baptized into Him.

Accordingly, Gal. vi. 10, we read of Christians as being $\omicron\iota\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$, servants of the Gospel, domestics of the Christian faith¹.

4 There are passages in the Epistles, in which it seems plain that faith is spoken of as separable from its results, as an assent to Christian truth, without the heart being duly moved by it, and so the life corresponding with it. That is to say, faith is used in that sense which the schoolmen called *fides informis*.

Thus St. Peter (2 Pet. i. 5) bids men 'add to their faith virtue' and all other Christian graces, as though faith might be considered as apart from other graces. St. Paul (1 Cor. xiii. 2) speaks of a faith strong enough to move mountains, and yet capable of being conceived of as without charity, and so of no value; and in the same chapter (ver. 13) speaks of faith, hope, charity, as three distinct graces, two of which shall pass away, and one alone, viz. charity, shall abide; and declares this

¹ So $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ is used for 'true religion,' Ps. LXXXVI. 11.

charity to be the greatest of the three. Especially St. James (ii. 14—26) considers the case of faith without works, and declares such a faith unable to justify.

5 Yet on the other hand, since it is the nature of faith to open the eye of the mind to things spiritual, and to bring home to it the view of Heaven, and hell, of God's justice and mercy, of man's liability to judgment, and Christ's Atonement and Mediation; therefore it is most commonly spoken of as an operative and active principle, 'purifying the heart' (Acts xv. 9), and 'working by love' (Gal. v. 6). Accordingly, in Heb. xi. St. Paul attributes to the energy of faith all the holiness and heroism of the saints and martyrs in times of old.

6 Especially, as the principal subjects of God's revelations are His promises, therefore faith came to mean *πεποιθῆναι*, *fiducia*, reliance on the truth of God's promises, or trust in His mercy and grace.

Of such a nature was that faith which gave men strength to benefit by the miraculous powers of Christ and His Apostles. Matt. ix. 2, 22: 'Thy faith hath made thee whole.' Acts xiv. 9, St. Paul perceived that the cripple at Lystra 'had faith to be healed.' See also Matt. viii. 16; ix. 29; xvii. 20; xxi. 21. Mark ii. 5; iv. 40; v. 34; x. 52; xi. 22. Luke v. 20; vii. 9; viii. 25, 48; xvii. 5, 6; xviii. 42. Acts iii. 16. Jam. v. 15.

So St. James speaks of 'praying in faith, nothing wavering' (James i. 6), that is, praying in a spirit of trust in God and reliance on His promises. St. Peter (1 Pet. v. 9) tells us to resist the devil, 'stedfast in the faith,' i.e. steadily relying on the help of God. Of such a nature seems to be 'the shield of faith' (Eph. vi. 16), which can 'quench the fiery darts of the wicked one.' So we read of 'faith and patience,' of 'the patience and faith of the saints' (Rev. ii. 19; xiii. 10), evidently signifying their resignation and *trust* in God under trials and afflictions. So perhaps we may say that in the above-cited

eleventh of Hebrews, faith is represented as a full conviction that what God had promised He was able and willing to perform; hence a trust or reliance on God's truth and promises, by which men overcame earthly temptations and difficulties, despised the world, and fought a good fight. See especially vv. 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 19, 26, 27.

Thus much of *faith* generally. The question next arises, In what sense does St. Paul use the word when he speaks of faith as justifying? Is justifying faith a bare historical assent? Is it but a synonym for the religion of Christ? Is it trust and confidence in God? Is it to be considered as full of its fruits and lively in its operation, or apart from all such, or at least prior to them?

Let us examine those passages of Scripture, whether St. Paul's or not, in which it is certain or probable that faith and justification are considered together, and see what attributes are assigned to the faith so spoken of.

Justifying faith then is :

1 The work and gift of God.

Matt. xvi. 17. John vi. 29, 44, 45. Eph. ii. 8. Phil. i. 29.

2 The character of the regenerate.

Compare Gal. v. 6, with Gal. vi. 15; whence it will appear that regeneration and justifying faith are used convertibly.

3 The sign of regeneration.

1 John v. 1: 'Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God,' his faith being the proof of his regeneration.

4 It is seated in the heart, not merely in the understanding.

Rom. x. 10: 'With the heart man believeth unto righteousness.'

5 Is not dead.

See James ii. 14—26; which proves clearly that if faith is dead, and so without works, it does not profit.

6 But, on the contrary, is a full conviction of the truth of God's promises and reliance on them.

See Heb. xi. 19, where Abraham's faith, when he offered up Isaac, is described as an 'accounting that God was able to raise him up even from the dead : ' which is the very example adduced by St. Paul, when he is specially treating on the subject of justifying faith (Rom. iv. 18—20), and by St. James, when he is rectifying errors on the same important subject (James ii. 23, &c).

7 It worketh by love.

Gal. v. 6 : where we read that that which '*availeth*' (i. e. justifieth) 'in Christ Jesus' is 'faith which worketh by love.'

8 Accordingly it sanctifies.

Acts xxvi. 18 : 'That they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are *sanctified by faith that is in Me.*'

9 It purifies the heart.

Acts xv. 9 : 'Purifying their hearts by faith.'

10 It overcomes the world.

1 John v. 4 : 'This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.'

Compare Hebrews xi., throughout the whole of which we have a description of faith as that which overcomes the world. And with this again compare (as before) Rom. iv. ; where the same kind of reasoning is used, and the same example adduced concerning *justifying* faith, as in Heb. xi. concerning faith *in the general*.

11 It is evidently connected with its results, and by a kind of *synecdoche*, considered as containing them¹, or pregnant with them.

¹ See Barrow.

This will plainly appear, if we examine the three passages in which Abraham's faith is said to have been imputed to him for righteousness, *i. e.* to have been justifying.

Those three passages are Gen. xv. 6. Rom. iv. James ii. 21—23, to which may be added Heb. xi. 8—10.

In Gen. xv. we read of God's promise to Abraham that he should have a son in his old age, whose seed should be as the stars of heaven for multitude. And unlikely as this was, and against all natural probability, Abraham 'believed in the Lord; and He counted it to him for righteousness,' ver. 6.

In Rom. iv. St. Paul quotes this instance of Abraham's faith, and illustrates it thus (ver. 18—22): 'Who against hope believed in hope, that he might become the father of many nations; according to that which was spoken, So shall thy seed be. And being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead, when he was about an hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sarah's womb: he staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God; and being fully persuaded that what He had promised He was able also to perform. And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness.'

Now St. James (ii. 21—23) reasons on the subject thus:

'Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the friend of God.'

And similar effects of his faith St. Paul himself speaks of, Heb. xi. 8:

'By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, *obeyed*; and he went out, not knowing whither he went.'

See also verses 9—12.

From all which passages it is sufficiently apparent that when the Scriptures speak of the *faith* of Abraham, which *justified* him, they understand by it a faith of such nature, that a man is persuaded by it to disregard all earthly considerations, and to resign himself, contrary to all his worldly interests, to obedient conformity with the will of God.

12 As it was seen of faith in general, that it had special reference to the promises and mercies of God ; so it will be found that *justifying faith* has special reference to the Person, sufferings, and mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ, and to God's promises in Him. For example, John iii. 14, 15 : 'As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up ; that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life.' John vi. 40 : 'This is the will of Him that sent Me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on Him, may have everlasting life.' Ver. 47 : 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on Me hath everlasting life.'

Acts x. 43 : 'Through His Name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins.' xvi. 31 : 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.'

Rom. iii. 25, 26 : 'Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His Blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God : to declare, I say, at this time, His righteousness, that He might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.' x. 9 : 'If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.' See also John i. 12 ; iii. 16, 18, 36 ; v. 24 ; vi. 29, 35 ; xi. 25, 26 ; xvi. 27 ; xvii. 25. Acts xiii. 38, 39 ; xx. 21. Rom. iii. 22 ; iv. 5, 24 ; x. 4. Philem. 5. 1 John iii. 23 ; v. 1.

So much indeed is this the character of faith (at least of

that active faith which, as we have seen, is the faith which justifies), that by it Christ is said to dwell in the heart. Ephes. iii. 17 : 'That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith.' And so it not only has reference to the work of Christ for us, but it is both the proof of Christ's dwelling in us, and the instrument whereby He dwells in us.

III. General View of *Justification* in Scripture.

Having premised thus much concerning the meaning attached to the term Justification, and to the grace of justifying faith, by the inspired writers in the new Testament, we may now perhaps proceed to state, more fully and formally, the doctrine of Scripture concerning justification, or pardon and acceptance with God.

In the general, then, we may state concerning the justification of man, that

1 The *moving* cause is God's mercy.

2 The *meritorious* cause is Christ's Atonement.

But we know that, notwithstanding the infinite mercy of God, and the fulness and all-sufficiency of the sacrifice of Christ, yet all men do not benefit by this grace. Therefore we learn that there is need of something internal to connect with the external work of our salvation; Christ in the heart connecting with Christ on the cross; the work of the Spirit to be united to the work of the Redeemer. Hence

3 The immediate efficient cause is the Holy Spirit, who moves the heart by His influences, leads to Christ, regenerates, and renews.

4 The first instrument by which God conveys pardon, under ordinary circumstances, is Baptism. Hence this is the first instrument of justification. This will appear from the following.

Even John's baptism (*à fortiori* Christ's) was a 'baptism of

repentance for the remission of sins' i.e. for justification. Mark i. 4. Luke iii. 3. When our Lord instituted His baptism, it was with the promise that all, who so far believed the preaching of the Apostles as to embrace the faith of Christ and be baptized into it, 'should be saved,' Mark xvi. 16. When the Apostles were asked by their converts what they should do, they replied, 'Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the *remission of sins*,' Acts ii. 37, 38. After St. Paul's conversion to the faith, Ananias called on him to 'arise and be baptized, and wash away his sins,' Acts xxii. 16.

The Apostle couples being '*washed*' with 'sanctified and justified,' 1 Cor. vi. 11; speaks of the Church as 'cleansed with the washing of water,' Eph. v. 26; and places the 'washing of regeneration' as a synonym or parallel with the 'being justified,' Tit. iii. 5. 7. See likewise Rom. vi. 4, 7. Col. ii. 12, 14. 1 Pet. iii. 21, &c.

Baptism is that which places us in a state of covenant with God, and hence, in St. Paul's words, is that in which 'we put on Christ,' and are esteemed 'the children of God by the faith in Christ,' Gal. iii. 26, 27. Hence a person receiving baptism is put in a position to receive from God the gifts which He has covenanted to give to us in His Son; and the first of those gifts is acceptance into His favour and remission of our sins, that is justification.

5 The state of heart in which a man must be, who is accepted or justified, is a state of faith, Rom. x. 10. Eph. iii. 17. Accordingly, when justification is considered subjectively, or as connected with the state of the Christian's heart, the instrument is said to be faith. Faith therefore may be considered either as the *instrument*, or as the *state* of justification.

6 When a man is said by St. James to be justified *by works*, it is not because his works procure him acceptance meritoriously, but because they are the sign, and fruit, and necessary results of his sanctification by the Spirit which unites

him to the Atonement of Christ, and are the necessary and inseparable concomitants, or, in fact, parts—of his faith, as much as light is part of the sun, or fruit is part of the tree which bears it.

Such may be fairly considered as a general view of the doctrine of justification as commonly taught in Scripture. But in order to a full investigation of this question, it is necessary to understand the peculiar signification attached by St. Paul to what may be considered his favourite formula, viz.

IV. Justification by faith.

Now it is quite clear that St. Paul's great object in the Epistle to the Romans was to put down all *claims* on the part of man to reward, for services done by him to God. Accordingly in the first three chapters he shews all men, whether Jews or Gentiles, to be *sinners*, and so *deserving* not justification or acquittal, but condemnation. His conclusion is, that, if we are saved, it must be by the merits of Christ or by free grace only; without any *claims* on our parts on the score of desert. Now this truth he expresses under the formula of 'Justification by faith.'

Hence we conclude that, in the language of St. Paul, 'justification by faith' and 'free salvation by grace' are (as it has been seen Melancthon, the Confession of Augsburg, and our own Article and Homilies, teach) correlative or convertible expressions. The former means the latter.

That this is the case will appear more plainly, if we read connectedly but a very few of the passages in which St. Paul especially propounds his doctrine of justification, *e.g.* Rom. iii. 23, 24. 28: 'All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being *justified freely by His grace*, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom &c. . . . therefore we conclude that a man is *justified by faith* without the deeds of the law.'

Eph. ii. 8: 'By grace are ye saved through faith,' &c.

Tit. iii. 4, 5, 7: 'After that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us that being justified by His grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.'

So Rom. iv. 25; v. 1, 9, 16, 20, 21, compared together, clearly shew the same thing.

'Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification. Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God,' Rom. iv. 25; v. i. 'Much more then, being now justified by His Blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him,' v. 9. 'The judgment was by one to condemnation: but the free gift is of many offences unto justification,' ver. 16. 'Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ,' vv. 20, 21.

But although we may readily come to the conclusion, that justification by faith is little more than a synonymous expression for justification or salvation by free grace; yet we can scarcely doubt that there is something in the nature of faith, which especially qualifies it to be put in a formula to denote *grace* in opposition to *claims*.

Now this would be the case if *faith* in the argument of the Epistle to the Romans meant nothing more than 'the Christian Religion;' which it sometimes appears to mean, especially in the Epistle to the Galatians. For, as the religion of Christ is that, by embracing which we embrace God's offers and promises of pardon, it might naturally be put to represent those promises and that grace by which pardon is given. But we can hardly conclude that this is the signification of justifying faith in the Epistle to the Romans, because St. Paul especially adduces the case of Abraham, as a subject of justifying faith (Rom. iv. 1, &c.). But Abraham could no more have been considered as

justified by the Gospel or the religion of Christ, than any other person under the old dispensation; and could not have been spoken of as living under the Gospel, in opposition to such as lived under the Law.

For a like reason the faith, of which the Apostle speaks, cannot mean *merely* a reliance on the Atonement, in which case we might understand more readily why it might be put, as it were, to represent the efficacy of that Atonement, to which it teaches its subjects to have recourse. For Abraham, whose case is brought forward as being the type of justifying faith, is not here spoken of as having full confidence in the pardoning grace of Christ; but his faith, in the instance alluded to (Gen. xv. 5, 6), had reference to God's promise, that his seed should be as numerous as the stars of Heaven. It was *this* faith which was counted to him for righteousness. And though it may be argued, that there was in this promise of God concerning his offspring virtually contained a promise of the Messiah; yet it can hardly be said, that Abraham's belief, that God would multiply his seed, meant a belief that he would be saved by the merits of Christ, and that, on this account, it was justifying faith.

We must therefore search for some more general reasons, than either of the above *exclusively*, why faith should be put, in the formula of St. Paul, as the representative of grace.

1 First then, faith is a state of heart, in which a man is, and is not an enumeration of so many works or good deeds, which a man has done, and for which he may be supposed to claim reward. It therefore fitly and naturally represents a state of grace, in contradistinction to a state of claim, or self-justification. It is that state in which a man is, who is regenerate, and so in union with Christ. Yet at the same time, as in the case of the penitent thief upon the cross, it may exist even before it can have brought forth external good works, and therefore obviously cannot recommend us to God on the score

of meritorious services, which we have rendered to Him. It is therefore the symbol of acceptance by free mercy, apart from human claims.

2 Next, its character is to rely on the power and promises of God, and not on the strength or works of man. For the eye of faith, seeing Him who is invisible, contrasts His power with its own weakness. Hence it becomes nearly identified with trust (*fiducia*). Such emphatically was the character of Abraham's faith, so specially referred to by the Apostle, which led him to leave his country and sacrifice his son, because 'he counted Him faithful, who had promised.' Hence faith becomes a fit symbol for renunciation of claims and deserts, and trust in God's mercy and pardoning grace.

3 Faith is perhaps, even more than other graces, clearly and obviously the gift of God, ('By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God,' Eph. ii. 8). We know we cannot force or control our own belief, and therefore feel that we require the eyes of our understanding to be enlightened by inspiration from above. Therefore again faith is less likely than other graces to be made a ground for boasting.

4 Lastly, although this be not its exclusive object, yet its peculiar and principal object is Christ, and His Atonement and Mediation. Hence, according to Luther, faith is 'full of Christ.' Hence, according to a greater than Luther, 'Christ dwells in our hearts by faith.' Hence faith, leading to Christ and looking to Christ, is, by a natural transition, spoken of in Scripture as if it were invested with attributes, which are really above it, and as though it effected that, of which it is but the instrument, and whose cause and Author is God in Christ.

On all these accounts we may conceive the expression or formula, 'Justification by faith,' to have been used by St. Paul,

to signify acceptance before God, by grace and mercy, in opposition to merit and claims.

V. Certain questions on the Doctrine of Justification.

1 Is justification an act or a state?

Some persons have decided that it is an act, taking place at a particular moment, never to be repeated. Others, that it is a state which continues or is lost, as the case may be.

If it is the former, it must be limited either (1) to baptism, when, as has been shewn, there is promise of remission of sins; or (2) to the moment, which may be considered as the turning point from a life of sin to a life of repentance, faith and holiness—a moment known only to God; or (3) to the day of Judgment, when the wicked shall be condemned, and the pious shall be absolved or justified. Either or all of these may be considered as the moment of transition from condemnation to justification, or pardon and acceptance.

But Scripture seems rather to represent justification as a *state* of acceptance before God. It is quite certain that some persons are represented as in favour, grace, or acceptance with God, that is justified; others as under His wrath, and liable to condemnation. The prophet Ezekiel (xxxiii. vv. 12—19) contrasts the condition of the righteous and the wicked, shewing the one to be a condition of acceptance, the other of condemnation: the former continuing so long as the character continues the same, and lost as soon as that character is lost: the latter in like manner continuing, until the wickedness is forsaken and the life renewed, and then giving place to the former, the condition of favour or pardon. In like manner our Lord (John xv. 1—10) speaks of His disciples as clean through His word, and continuing so whilst they abide in Him; but if they abide not in Him, then to be cast forth as a branch, withered, and even burned (see especially vv. 3—6). Language just similar to this is used by St. Paul (see Rom. vi. 1, 2, 19; xi. 20, 21.

Gal. v. 4. Col. i. 22, 23. Heb. x. 38, 39). From all which we can hardly fail to conclude, that justification before God is a *state*, in which a person continues so long as he continues united to Christ, abiding in Him, having Christ dwelling in his heart, being the subject of His grace, and of the sanctification of the Spirit.

If therefore the premises are correct, we may define justification to be a state of pardon and acceptance in the presence of God, bestowed upon us freely for Christ's sake, by the mercy of God, which is first given in baptism to all who receive that sacrament aright, which continues so long as the subject continues in a state of faith, which fails when he falls from the state of faith, and which is restored again, when by grace and repentance he is restored to a state of faith. So that we may say, whilst in a state of faith, so long in a state of justification: whilst a believer, so long a justified person. Hence too, concerning the distinction drawn by Luther, that faith is *alone* when it justifies, and that after justification is effected, then come in charity, and good works, and holiness, we may infer that such a distinction can be true only when considered in the abstract, but not as a matter of practical experience. For practically and really, where there is acceptance there is faith and sanctification, and, springing from them and reigning with them, are all the graces of a Christian's life.

2 It having been laid down that faith (*facta operibus*) may be considered either as the *state* or the *instrument* of justification, it may be a question, whether we ought to say that faith, or faith and good works, or faith and holiness, are the *condition* or *conditions* of justification.

The answer to this question, as given by many divines of high authority in the Church, has been in the affirmative. But the question is, whether or not we can deduce an affirmative answer from the Scripture. No doubt, faith and holiness are, *as regards* justification, graces *sine quibus non*. There is no

justification nor salvation, where there is not faith, love, holiness, obedience. But when we state that faith and good works are *conditions*, we in effect suppose the Almighty to offer us what have been called the *Terms of the Gospel*; terms that is of the following kind: 'Now, that by Christ's mediation God's wrath has been appeased, if you will repent, believe, and obey, you shall be saved.' Conditions imply a bargain of this kind. Now there may be no objection to looking on the matter in some such light as this; but it does not appear to be the form in which the Scriptures represent God's dealings with us. The new Testament seems to speak of us as pensioners on the bounty of God's grace. Especially when justification by faith is spoken of, 'it is *of faith*, that it might be *by grace*,' Rom. iv. 16. And though it is true that it would be an act of immeasurable grace for God to pardon our past sins, on condition that, by His help, we avoided sin and lived holily for the future; yet this does not appear to be the statement any where made by the Apostles; nor does such an act of grace come up to the standard of that infinite mercy of God in Christ Jesus, which is revealed to us in the Gospel. It has already been shewn, that one peculiar reason why justification by faith represents free salvation by grace, is, that faith is itself most clearly 'the gift of God,' Eph. ii. 8. Therefore it is spoken of as the instrument of our justification, not because it is a *condition*, which we can make with Him, but because it is itself *a gift* which He bestows on us.

Besides, if we could make conditions with God, even after He had accepted an atonement for the past, it might be hard to say that 'boasting' was altogether 'excluded' (Rom. iii. 27). Excluded indeed it might be in strict justice, because the forgiving of past sins, and the accepting of imperfect obedience for the future, would be, of itself, an act of boundless grace, when we deserve nothing but condemnation. But still, comparing ourselves with ourselves, we might easily be inclined to feel

proud of even imperfect obedience, if it were made the condition of our salvation. Therefore, we may perhaps fairly conclude that salvation is not of works, not merely not as the cause, but not even as the terms or conditions of our justification. Nor is faith itself the condition on which God accepts us, although it is the instrument by which He justifies us, and the state in which we are when justified.

3 Whereas it is taught by St. Paul that a man is justified by faith, and yet it is taught both by St. Paul and throughout the new Testament that we shall be judged according to our works¹: are we driven to conclude that there is an inconsistency in the statements of Scripture?

The answer to this is, that as all persons who are justified are regenerate and in a state of faith, their faith and regeneration will necessarily be to them the source of holiness and good works. Now the clearest tokens both to men and angels of their internal condition of faith and sanctification must be their good works; nay, the clearest proof even to themselves. Hence that they should be judged by their works, and rewarded according to their works, is thoroughly consistent with God's dispensations. The meritorious cause indeed of their salvation is Christ's Atonement; the instrument by which they are brought into covenant with God is baptism; the means whereby their state of acceptance is maintained is faith; but the criterion, by which their final state will be determined, shall be works. And all these are so knit up together in the redeemed, regenerate, believing, sanctified Christian, that it is no wise derogating from the excellence of the one to ascribe its proper office, in the economy of salvation, to the other.

4 The ordinary instruments of justification being baptism

¹ See, for instance, Matt. xvi. 27; Rom. ii. 6; 1 Cor. iii. 8; 2 Cor. v. 10; 1 Pet. i. 17; Rev. ii. 23, xx. 13, xxii. 12.

and faith, can a person be justified where either of these is wanting?

That persons can be justified without faith, where faith is impossible, may appear from the case of infants. Though they are too young for active faith, yet clearly not for salvation, and therefore for justification. Our Lord bids us bring little children to Him, and says that 'of such is the Kingdom of Heaven' (Mark x. 14). And St. Paul says the children of believing parents are holy (1 Cor. vii. 14). And if infant baptism be a custom, for which we have sufficient authority, then, as baptism is for the remission of sins, it follows that infants in baptism may receive remission of sins or justification, though not yet capable of faith. Similar reasoning is applicable to the case of idiots, or persons otherwise irresponsible, who, like infants, are incapable of active faith, but of whom we may reasonably hope that they are not incapable of salvation. As regards baptism, that, as a general rule, it is the ordinance of God, without which we cannot look for the promises of God, is quite apparent from passages already referred to, such as Mark xvi. 16. Acts xxii. 16. Gal. iii. 26, 27, &c. In these and similar passages remission of sins is promised to such as believe the Gospel, and submit to baptism. Yet, as we have seen concerning faith, that, though generally necessary, yet cases may, and do exist, where it is impossible, and so not required; in like manner we may reasonably conclude that cases may exist in which baptism may be dispensed with. Though Christ has appointed baptism, and we have no right to look for His blessing if we neglect it, yet we cannot presume to limit His mercy even by His own ordinances. Indeed we find in the Acts of the Apostles (x. 4, 44) a case, the case of Cornelius, in which God accepted and poured His Holy Spirit on a person who had not been baptized; and though St. Peter thought it necessary that baptism should be at once administered to him, and thereby taught us the deep value of that sacrament, still

this case sufficiently shews that God does at times work without the intervention of means appointed by Himself, and therefore teaches us that we must not exclude from salvation those who, from ignorance or inability, have not received the blessing of baptism.

5 Is the language of St. James opposed to the doctrine of St. Paul?

It has been already seen that St. Paul means by Justification by faith, free salvation by God's grace; and that, where he speaks of faith as the instrument of justification, he means a lively faith, productive of good works. (See especially Rom. vi.). St. James probably wrote against such as abused the doctrine of St. Paul, and taught that a speculative barren faith was sufficient for salvation without the fruits of faith. Accordingly he asks 'Can this faith save him?' He says, 'Faith, if it have not works, is dead, being alone¹.' But it must be observed that St. Paul never speaks of a dead faith as profiting. On the contrary, he declares that faith without charity would be nothing (1 Cor. xiii. 2). It is plain therefore that St. Paul considers faith as full of its results, and does not design to put in opposition to one another faith and the good works which naturally spring out of a lively faith, but rather faith and legal works—'the works of the Law'—works done in a self-justifying spirit, and looked on as meriting reward. Faith,

¹ James ii. 14, 17.

Many people have endeavoured to reconcile St. Paul and St. James by supposing that the former speaks of justification before God, the latter of justification in the sight of men. But it is quite clear that St. James speaks of the same kind of justification as St. Paul, from Jas. ii. 14, 23. In the former verse he speaks of faith without works as not capable of *saving* a man; *i. e.* of course, of justifying him before God, for justification before man can never *save*. And in the latter verse, he adduces the case of Abraham, as of one who had a faith which brought forth works, and says it was this kind of faith which was imputed to him for righteousness, *i. e.* clearly before God.

therefore, he declares, justifies without such works—the works of the Law; but he does not say, that a faith, which does not bring forth the works of faith, will justify. On the other hand, St. James asserts that faith will not justify, if it do not bring forth good works; but by good works he means evangelical works, the works of faith, not legal works, the works of the Law. Hence there is no necessary contradiction in the language of the two Apostles. St. James simply considers justifying faith as *including* the works of *faith*. St. Paul considers justifying faith as *excluding* the works of the *Law*¹.

¹ Sine operibus fidei, non legis, mortua est fides.—Hieron. on Gal. iii.

ARTICLE XII.

Of Good Works.

ALBEIT that good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith; insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known, as a tree discerned by the fruit.

De Bonis Operibus.

BONA opera, quæ sunt fructus fidei, et justificados sequuntur, quanquam peccata expiare, et divini judicii severitatem ferre non possunt: Deo tamen grata sunt, et accepta in Christo, atque ex vera et viva fide necessario profluunt, ut planè ex illis, æque fides viva cognosci possit, atque arbor ex fructu judicari.

SECTION I.

HISTORY.

THE great length at which the last Article was considered, renders it less necessary to say much upon this. Our present twelfth Article did not exist in the forty-two Articles of King Edward's reign, but was added in the year 1562, after the accession of Queen Elizabeth. It is evidently intended as a kind of supplement to the eleventh, lest that should be supposed to teach Solifidianism. Archbishop Laurence traces the wording of it to a passage in the Wirtemberg Confession, to which it certainly bears great resemblance¹.

¹ The passage is:

De Bonis Operibus.

Non est autem sentiendum, quod in bonis operibus, quæ per nos facimus, in judicio Dei, ubi agitur de expiatione peccatorum, et placatione divinæ iræ, ac merito æternæ salutis, confidendum sit. Omnia enim bona

The general object of the Article was, no doubt, to oppose the Antinomian errors which had originated in Agricola, and which there was some danger might spring from Lutheranism¹. With such the whole Reformation was charged by the divines of the Roman communion, and therefore it was the more needful that the reformers should protest against them.

There are certain particular expressions also in the Article which require to be explained historically. We have seen that the schoolmen talked of good works, done without the grace of God, meriting grace *de congruo*. To this Luther and the reformers opposed the statement, that works done without the grace of God might be apparently, but were not really good. And to this purpose is the thirteenth Article of our Church, which we have soon to consider. Luther asserted that good works, which are pleasing to God, are not wrought but in faith; for ‘whatever is not of faith is sin;’ and where there is faith there is justification; therefore good works follow, not precede justification. Our Article uses this language, without in this place discussing the merits of it. In the thirteenth Article the question is more fully entered on. It may be mentioned, that language very similar had before been used by Augustine, and from him very probably was it borrowed by Luther. ‘Good works,’ says that father, ‘follow a man’s justification, do not precede it in order that he may be justified².’

Another expression in the Article is, that ‘good works cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God’s judgment.’ In the historical account of the last Article we saw that the Council of Trent condemned Luther for denying

opera, quæ nos facimus, sunt imperfecta, nec possunt severitatem divini judicii ferre.—Laurence, *B. L.* Notes on Serm. II. p. 234.

¹ Mosh. *Ch. Hist.* Cent. XVI. § III. Pt. II. as quoted in the last Article.

² Sequuntur opera bona justificatum, non præcedunt justificandum.—*De Fide et Operibus*, c. 14.

intrinsic goodness to works done after grace, and asserted that, as they were wrought by the Spirit of God, they were essentially good and perfect. The Council also taught that to the justified God's commandments are possible, that justification is preserved and increased by good works, that the good works of the just, which are the gifts of God, are withal the merits of the justified¹.

We have seen also that Bellarmine and the Romanist divines assert that good works, which are wrought in us by the grace of God, are, by virtue of that grace, meritorious of eternal life²; *i. e.* according to the schoolmen, they merit reward *de condigno*. The words of our Article are evidently opposed to these opinions. For, though they speak plainly of the necessity and value of works wrought by grace, they declare that 'they cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment.'

¹ Session vi. Canon 18, 24, 32.

² Bellarmine, *De Justificatione*, Lib. v. cap. 12, quoted in the History of Art. xi.

SECTION II.

SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

WE may perceive, from what has been said, that the Article opposes three doctrines.

- I. Merit *de congruo* ;
- II. Merit *de condigno* ;
- III. Antinomianism.

Or otherwise the Article teaches :

- I. That good works follow after justification :
- II. That, though they spring from the grace of God and a lively faith, still they cannot put away sin and endure the severity of God's judgment :
- III. Yet (1) that in Christ they are pleasing to God : and (2) That they spring out necessarily of a true and lively, *i. e.* a justifying faith ; insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known, as a tree is discerned by its fruit.

I. The question of merit *de congruo* and works before justification being the special subject of the next Article, we may defer its consideration till we consider that Article.

II. That the good works of justified men are not perfect enough to put away sin, and endure the severity of God's judgment, may be proved as follows.

Our Lord tells us that, after we have done all that is commanded us, 'we are still unprofitable servants, having done only that which was our duty to do' (Luke xvii. 10). But if this be the case, how can we ever do anything to put away our former sins ? Our best deeds leave us still unprofitable ; and

if we had never sinned, we should still have only done our duty, and could claim no reward. But when we have sinned, it is clear that no degree of subsequent obedience (which would have been due, even if we had not sinned) can cancel the sins which are past. And to this we must add that, even under grace, obedience is never perfect. 'In many things we offend all,' says St. James (iii. 2); and St. John tells us that, 'if we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves' (1 John i. 8). And both the Apostles are evidently speaking to, and of, regenerate Christians. The Psalmist prays God not to 'enter into judgment with him, because in His sight *no man living* could be justified' (Psalm cxliii. 2). Accordingly St. Paul argues, that the person who is blessed in God's sight, is, not the man who lives blameless in the Law, but 'he whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered,' even 'the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin' (Rom. iv. 7, 8). 'All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;' and therefore must be 'justified freely by His grace, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus' (Rom. iii. 23, 24). Such passages fully prove that, in whatever strength or power good works are wrought, they are not perfect enough to put away sin, and to endure the judgment of God.

Still, though the Church denies the *merit* of good works, and their sufficiency to screen us from the wrath and endure the judgment of God, she yet teaches,

III. 1. That, in Christ, they are pleasing and acceptable to God; and 2, that they do necessarily spring out of a true and lively faith.

1. In Christ they are pleasing and acceptable to God.

(1) The words *in Christ* are introduced to remind us, that whatever is good in us must spring from the grace of Christ, and whatever in us is acceptable to God is acceptable for

Christ's sake. In all the servants of Christ, God sees the image of His Son. In all the members of Christ, God sees the Spirit of His Son, descending from the Head to the members, like the holy oil on Aaron's head, which flowed down to the skirts of his clothing. In all the branches of the heavenly Vine, God sees the fruit thereof as put forth by virtue of the life and nourishment derived from the Vine itself; and that Vine is Christ. In every wedding-guest, who has on the wedding-garment, the King sees the wearer clothed in the robe of His own Son, and acknowledges them all as His children: 'for we are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus: for as many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ' (Gal. iii. 26, 27.) Accordingly, the Scriptures constantly, when they speak of Christians and the works of Christians as pleasing to God, teach us that it is 'in Christ.' So we read, 'There is now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus' (Rom. viii. 1). 'In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love' (Gal. v. 6). 'We are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works' (Ephes. ii. 10). We are to 'do all in the name of the Lord Jesus' (Col. iii. 17). We are to 'offer spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ' (1 Pet. ii. 5). We are to 'give thanks always for all things unto God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ' (Eph. v. 20). 'By Him we are to offer the sacrifices of praise to God' (Heb. xiii. 15).

(2) But then the good deeds which Christians perform in Christ are *pleasing and acceptable to God*.

Our Lord tells us, that 'not every one that saith unto Him, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven; but he that doeth the will of His Father which is in Heaven' (Matt. vii. 21). He assures us of the reward of those who have left all for His sake, that they shall receive a hundredfold, and eternal life (Mark x. 29, 30). He tells us, that, 'if we forgive, we

shall be forgiven ; that if we give, it shall be given to us' (Mark xi 26 ; Luke vi. 37, 38). He shews us by parables that those who of two talents make five, shall receive five cities ; those who make of five talents ten, shall receive ten cities (Matt. xxv. 14—30. Compare Luke xix. 12—26). He tells us that, at the judgment-day, they who have fed the hungry, clothed the naked, and visited the afflicted, shall be placed on the right hand, and go into life eternal (Matt. xxv. 31—46). He tells us of 'a prophet's reward,' and 'a righteous man's reward' (Matt. x. 41, 42). And, in short, assures us that He will 'reward every man according to his works' (Matt. xvi. 27).

So, from His Apostles we learn, that 'in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him' (Acts x. 35). That the sacrifice of our bodies is 'acceptable to God' (Rom xii. 1) : that the labour of Christ's servants 'shall not be in vain in the Lord' (1 Cor. xv. 58) : that 'God loveth a cheerful giver' (2 Cor. ix. 7) : that, if we are not 'weary in well-doing, in due season we shall reap, if we faint not' (Gal. vi. 9) : that our new creation in Christ Jesus is 'unto good works, which God hath beforehand ordained that we should walk in' (Eph. ii. 10) : that the new man 'after God is created in righteousness and true holiness' (Eph. iv. 24) : that our calling is 'not to uncleanness, but to holiness' (1 Thess. iv. 7) : that 'every one who nameth the name of Christ must depart from iniquity' (2 Tim. ii. 19) ; must 'be careful to maintain good works' (Tit. iii. 8) : that 'without holiness no man shall see the Lord' (Heb. xii. 14) : that with 'such sacrifices' for His service 'God is well pleased' (Heb. xiii. 16) : that 'pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world' (Jas. i. 27) : that faith without works will not profit' (Jas. ii. 14) : that 'to do well and suffer for it, and take it patiently, is acceptable to

God' (1 Pet. ii. 20) : that whatsoever we ask of God we receive, if ' we keep His commandments, and do those things which are pleasing in His sight : ' and that ' he that keepeth His commandments dwelleth in Him, and He in him ' (1 John iii. 22, 24. Compare Rom. vi. *passim*, Rom. viii. 1—14, and the concluding chapters of all St. Paul's Epistles).

Thus we plainly see, that good works wrought in Christ are not only useful and desirable, but are absolutely necessary, for every Christian, and are pleasing and acceptable to God. ' We do not take away the *reward*, because we deny the *merit* of good works. We know that in the keeping of God's commandments there is *great reward* (Ps. xix. 11) ; and that unto him that soweth righteousness there shall be a *sure reward* (Prov. xi. 18). But the question is, whence he that soweth in this manner must expect to reap so great and so sure a harvest ; whether from God's justice, which he must do if he stand upon merit, or from His mercy, as a recompence freely bestowed out of God's gracious bounty, and not in justice due for the worth of the work performed. Which question, we think the Prophet Hosea hath sufficiently resolved, when he biddeth us *sow to ourselves in righteousness, and reap in MERCY* (Hos. x. 12). Neither do we hereby any whit detract from the truth of that axiom, that *God will give every man according to his works* ; for still the question remaineth the very same, whether God may not judge a man according to his works, when he sitteth upon the throne of grace, as well as when he sitteth upon the throne of justice ? And we think here, that the Prophet David hath fully cleared the case in that one sentence, Psalm lxii. 12, ' *With Thee, O Lord, is MERCY* ; for Thou rewardest every one according to his work. '

' Originally therefore, and in itself, we hold that this reward proceedeth merely from God's free bounty and mercy ; but accidentally, in regard that God hath tied Himself by His Word and promise to confer such a reward, we grant that it now

proveth in a sort to be an act of justice; even as in *forgiving of our sins*, which in itself all men know to be an act of mercy, He is said to be *faithful and just* (1 Joh. i. 9), namely, in regard of the faithful performance of his promise¹.

To conclude then, the Scriptures prove, and the Church teaches, that, not upon the ground of merit, but yet according to God's will and appointment, good works, wrought in Christ, are necessary for every Christian, are pleasing and acceptable to God, and will in the end receive 'great recompence of reward,' even that 'crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give in that day' (2 Tim. iv. 8).

2 That good works 'do spring out necessarily of a true and living faith,' is a proposition which may be considered to have been incidentally but fully proved in treating on the eleventh Article. It may therefore here be sufficient to refer but briefly to a few of the passages of Scripture in which this is most plainly set forth.

The sixth chapter of Romans throughout is an explanation, entered into by the Apostle, to shew that his doctrine of justification does not supersede the necessity of good works; inasmuch as justified persons walk in newness of life, are made free from sin, and become servants of righteousness. The eleventh chapter of Hebrews is an enumeration of signal works of holiness, which were produced through the energizing power of the faith, by which the saints of old lived and acted. St. James, in his famous chapter (ii. vv. 14—26), explains at length that, if faith be living, it will necessarily bring forth works, and that if there be no works, the faith is dead. We read of being 'sanctified by faith' in Christ (Acts xxvi. 18). God is said to 'purify the heart by faith' (Acts xv. 9). Faith is said to be 'the victory which overcometh the world' (1 John v. 4). The

¹ Usher, *Answer to a Jesuit*, Chap. xii.

faith, which 'availeth in Christ Jesus,' is called 'faith which worketh by love' (Gal. v. 6).

Perhaps the strongest proof of this proposition is that, in all those writings of St. Paul (especially his Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians) where he peculiarly treats of faith, he passes directly from faith to speak of holiness, counselling Christians, as the consequence of his doctrine concerning faith, to bring forth good works. This we may observe in the latter chapters of both these Epistles, and indeed of all his Epistles. The eleventh chapter of Hebrews indeed, which professes to explain to us what faith is, does so almost entirely by giving a list of the works which have sprung from it; just as one, who wished to describe the excellence of a fruit-tree, would dwell chiefly on the beauty and goodness of its fruit.

We may be assured therefore, that we cannot assign too high a place to good works, so long as we do not assign to them the power of *meriting* salvation. They spring from faith and they feed faith; for the more faith is called into action the brighter and the stronger it grows. And as in the bodily economy of man, good health gives birth to good spirits, and yet again, good spirits support and invigorate health; so is it in his spiritual life. Faith gives rise to holiness, and holiness gives energy to faith.

ARTICLE XIII.

Of Works before Justification.

WORKS done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of His Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ; neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the school-authors say) deserve grace of congruity: yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.

De Operibus ante Justificationem.

OPERA quæ fiunt ante gratiam Christi, et Spiritus ejus afflatum, cum ex fide Jesu Christi non prodeant, minime Deo grata sunt; neque gratiam, ut multi vocant, de congruo merentur: immo cum non sint facta, ut Deus illa fieri voluit et præcepit, peccati rationem habere non dubitamus.

SECTION I.

HISTORY.

THIS Article is intimately connected with the four preceding Articles, and is intended, probably, to prevent any mistakes, and more fully to explain some points in them.

In the former Articles an account has been given of most of the errors against which this Article is directed; and the very wording of it shews that the scholastic doctrine of congruous merit is especially aimed at. Here, however, it may be proper to remark, that the question has arisen concerning the nature of heathen virtue, a question of great difficulty, on which the fathers touched, both before and after the Pelagian controversy. Clement of Alexandria particularly speculated much upon the mode in which God's grace and the teaching of Christ visited men before the coming of the Gospel. 'His notion was, that philosophy was given to the Gentiles by God, for the same

purpose for which the Law was given to the Jews; in order to prepare them for justification under the Gospel by faith in Christ.' 'It is certain, however, that Clement did not believe that heathen virtue possessed of itself any efficacy towards justification. For he says, that every action of the heathen is sinful, since it is not sufficient that an action is right; its object or aim must also be right¹.'

Indeed, these opinions of Clement do not seem to interfere at all with the doctrine of this Article; for Clement evidently considered that God mysteriously worked in the Gentiles by His grace, using, as an external means, the imperfect instrument of their own philosophy. So that whatever good, he thought, may have existed in heathens, he still ascribed to God's grace, and therefore did not consider their goodness 'as works done before the grace of Christ².'

We have already seen how the Pelagians and Semi-pelagians³ denied the necessity of preventing grace; and held that, in the first instance, God only called men by His word and ordinances, and that by their own strength such as were called might turn to God, and seek His assistance.

In controversy, they appear to have referred to the case of virtuous heathens, many of whom might put to shame the lives of Christians. To Julianus, who advances this argument, Augustine replies at great length. Augustine's position was, that 'what was not of faith was sin.' Julianus supposes the case of a heathen, who covers the naked and does works of mercy; and asks, 'If a Gentile have clothed the naked, is this act of his therefore sin, because it is not of faith⁴?' Augustine

¹ Bishop Kaye, on the Writings of Clement of Alexandria, p. 426. See also pp. 122, seq.

² See Bishop Kaye as above, p. 122, &c.

³ See History of Art. ix. and x.

⁴ Si gentilis, inquis, nudum operuerit, numquid quia non est ex fide, peccatum est?

replies that it is ; ‘not because the simple act of covering the naked is sin, but because none but the impious would deny, that not to glory in the Lord on account of such a work, was sin¹.’ He then goes on to argue, that a bad tree cannot bring forth really good fruit, that an unbelieving tree is a bad tree, and that apparently good works are not always really so, as the clemency of Saul in sparing Agag was sin. So he who does unbelievingly, whatever he does, does ill ; and he who does ill, sins². The good works which an unbeliever does are the works of Him who turns evil to good. But without faith we cannot please God³. If the eye be evil, the whole body is dark ; whence we may learn, that he who does not do good works with the good intention of a good faith (that is, of a faith which worketh by love), his whole body is full of darkness. And since the good works, or apparent good works, of unbelievers cannot bring them to Heaven, we ought to hold that true goodness can never be given but by the grace of God through Christ, so as to bring a man to the kingdom of God⁴.

This was the kind of reasoning which the fathers of that day used against the Pelagian arguments, that truly good deeds might be done without the grace of God⁵.

The doctrine of the schoolmen, concerning grace of congruity, bore a suspicious resemblance to that of Semi-pelagians.

¹ Prorsus in quantum non est ex fide, peccatum est. Non quia per se ipsum factum est, quod est nudum operire, peccatum est ; sed de tali opere non in Domino gloriari, solus impius negat esse peccatum. *Cont. Julianum*. Lib. iv. c. 30.

² Cap. 31.

³ Cap. 32.

⁴ Aut certe quoniam saltem concedis opera infidelium, quæ tibi eorum videntur bona, non tamen eos ad salutem sempiternam regnumque perducere : scito nos illud bonum hominum dicere, illam voluntatem bonam, illud opus bonum, sine Dei gratia quæ datur per unum Mediatorem Dei et hominum nemini posse conferri ; per quod solum homo potest ad æternum Dei donum regnumque perducì. Cap. 33.

⁵ The reader may see many passages from Jerom, Prosper, and others, to the same effect, in Usher’s *Answer to a Jesuit*, Ch. xi.

In the history of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh Articles enough has been said on this subject; and of the zeal with which Luther maintained the absolute necessity of preventing grace, in order that man should make any efforts, or take any steps towards godliness¹.

The case of Cornelius (Acts x.) was an argument often made use of in favour of grace of congruity. He, it was said, was a Gentile, and therefore not under the influence of God's grace; and yet it was told him, 'Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God' (ver. 4). Hence it was argued, that he did what was acceptable to God, though without the grace of God.

Luther treats Cornelius as a man who had faith in a promised Mediator, although he did not yet know that that Mediator was come; and so, he argues, that his good deeds were of faith, and therefore acceptable².

At the council of Trent the general opinion was strongly against Luther on these points. Catarinus indeed maintained, with great learning, that 'man, without the special help of God, can do no work which may be truly good, though morally, but sinneth still.' In confirmation of which, he quoted Augustine, Ambrose, Prosper, Anselm, and others. He was violently opposed by the Franciscans, but supported by the Dominicans³.

In the end, the seventh canon of the sixth session of the council condemned those who said, 'That works done before justification are sins, and that a man sinneth the more, by how much the more he laboureth to dispose himself to grace⁴.' Which canon does not exactly contradict the words of our Article, except it be in the last sentence of it.

The Lutheran Confessions of faith speak very reasonably on this subject. The twentieth article of the Confession of Augs-

¹ See especially Luther on Gal. ii. 16, and Laurence, *B. L.* p. 10.

² Luther on Gal. iii. 2.

³ Sarpi, pp. 183—185.

⁴ Session vi. Can. 7; and Sarpi, p. 210.

burg states a principal reason for maintaining justification by faith to be, that we might not think to deserve grace by our own good works antecedent to grace¹.

Our own reformers seem to have been influenced by a very similar view. The Homilies say, that 'without faith can no good work be done, accepted and pleasant to God.' 'Without faith all that is done of us is but dead before God; although the work seem never so gay and glorious before man².'

Again, 'As the good fruit is not the cause that the tree is good, but the tree must first be good before it can bring forth good fruit; so the good deeds of man are not the cause which maketh man good, but he is first made good by the Spirit and grace of God, that effectually worketh in him, and afterward he bringeth forth good fruits³.'

'They are greatly deceived that preach repentance without Christ, and teach the simple and ignorant that it consisteth only in the works of men. They may indeed speak many things of good works, and of amendment of life and manners: but without Christ they be all vain and unprofitable. They that think that they have done much of themselves towards repentance, are so much the farther from God, because they do seek those things in their own works and merits, which ought only to be sought in our Saviour Jesus Christ, and in the merits of His death and passion and bloodshedding⁴.'

¹ *Sylloge*, pp. 130, 131.

² First part of Homily on Good Works.

³ Second part of the Homily on Almsdeeds.

⁴ First part of the Homily of Repentance.

SECTION II.

SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

THE subjects embraced by the Article are,

I. That works before grace and the inspiration of the Spirit are not pleasing to God, forasmuch as they are not of faith.

II. They do not make men meet to receive grace *de congruo*.

III. Rather, as not being done as God hath willed, it is believed that they have the nature of sin.

Of these three positions, the second must follow from the proof of the first. For if good works without grace are not pleasing to God, they cannot predispose to grace. As regards the *title* of the Article, 'Of Works before Justification,' we may observe, that it was probably adopted because the question discussed in the Article itself went, at the time of the Reformation, and the council of Trent, under that name¹. All questions concerning merit *de congruo*, and works done before grace, were considered as embraced in the general term, 'the question concerning works before justification.' The Article itself says nothing about *justification*. All that it determined is, that

¹ Luther had used this language, that a man was justified first, and then did good works; and so 'works before justification,' became a common expression. Our Church in the xiith Article speaks of good works as 'following after justification.' We are not, of course, bound to consider that every act of a man, who is not in a state of full sanctification, is therefore devoid of goodness, and of the nature of sin. This Article sufficiently explains both its own meaning and the meaning of the phrase, 'follow after justification,' in the xiith Article, viz. that no works are good which do not come of grace. And, as regards ordinary Christians, we know that the Church looks on all baptized persons as *justified*, until they themselves fall from grace.

in order for works to be acceptable to God, they must be done by the grace of God, and must spring from a principle of faith.

Against the whole tenor of the Article, and in favour of all which it condemns, the principal arguments from Scripture are such as these. Certain passages of Scripture seem to speak highly of particular individuals, who were not Christians or true believers, *e. g.* Naaman the Syrian, and Cornelius the centurion. They had not the faith of Christ, and yet their good deeds are approved. It may, however, be replied, that both of them evidently acted from a principle of faith. Naaman went to the prophet and sought relief, because he believed that, as a prophet, he had power to heal him. Again, Cornelius, though not a Jew, was evidently a believer in the One true God, a *proselyte of the gate*, if not a *proselyte of righteousness*; and therefore we cannot say that he had no faith, nor that he was without the grace of God.

The same may be said of the Ninevites. Their repentance, it is argued, was accepted by God; and yet they were heathens, and therefore not true believers. But it is certain that their repentance sprang from their faith in Jonah's preaching, and may very probably have been produced by that Holy Spirit, who at all times has striven with men: and hence it was not of the nature of simple, naked, unassisted efforts to do good.

A stronger argument against the doctrine of this Article seems derivable from the language of St. Paul, Rom. ii. 14, 26, 27. There he speaks of the Gentiles or heathens, 'which have not a law,' and yet 'do by nature the things contained in the Law,' and so 'are a law unto themselves.' And he says, that 'if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the Law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision? And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfil the Law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the Law?' Here the apostle seems to speak as if the

heathen, who had not the revealed knowledge of God's will, yet might so do His will as to be acceptable with Him.

In like manner many learned men of the Reformed as well as the Roman Communions understand St. Paul's reasoning in Gal. iv. to be like what was shewn in the last Section to have been the opinion of Clement of Alexandria; viz. that before the Gospel both Jews and Gentiles were kept by God in a state of bondage or tutelage, waiting for the liberty of the children of God; that to the heathen their condition was one of elementary servitude, preparatory to the Gospel, as was that of the Jews. If the first seven verses of this chapter be compared carefully with the eighth and ninth, there will appear some ground for such an interpretation. From these passages it is argued, that heathens, who could not have faith, and were not subjects of grace, were yet capable in their degree of pleasing God.

To this reasoning we may reply, that nothing can be more obscure than the question as to God's dealings with and purposes concerning the heathen world. Revelation is addressed to those whom it concerns, and tells us very little of the state of those to whom it is not addressed. Our business is to follow Christ, and not to ask 'Lord, and what shall this man do?' There is a marked purpose in Scripture not to satisfy man's idle curiosity. The question therefore, at times so much debated, whether it be possible or impossible that the benefits of Christ's redemption should reach to those millions of human beings who never have heard and never could hear of Him, is left in deep obscurity; and when people have reasoned on the subject, their arguments have mostly been inferences deduced from other doctrines and not express statements of Scripture.

This much, however, we may fairly conclude, that if the passages just referred to, prove that the heathen can do what is pleasing to God, and be accepted by Him; it is because

His Holy Spirit can plead with them, even through the imperfect means of natural religion. St. Paul says, it was God's will that men 'should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after Him' (Acts xvii. 27). And he is there speaking of the world in its times of heathen darkness. It is possible that there may have been an imperfect faith, even 'in times of ignorance which God winked at.' We know not but that they, who touched but the hem of Christ's garment, may have found virtue go out of it.

But with regard to the teaching of our Article, we may fairly conclude that it rather refers to the case of persons within, not without the sound of the Gospel. This is the practical question. It does not concern us practically to know how it may be with the heathen; although, of course, their case affects the general question. And the case of the heathen is so obscure, that we can hardly be justified in bringing it to throw light on a case which concerns ourselves and our own state before God.

But it may be farther said, that God approves of justice, and temperance, and charity, in themselves, and of themselves; and therefore if a man, who has neither faith nor grace, acts justly, and does mercy, and lives soberly, God must approve and be pleased with such acts, just as He would disapprove and hate the contrary. But, in reply, it is urged that God sees the heart, and loves what is good in us, only when it springs from a good source. Indeed, there are some sinners much greater sinners than others, whom He will visit with 'greater damnation.' But, though in themselves He loves justice and mercy, He does not love and accept the man who does them, unless that man does them from right motives; and as 'every good and perfect gift is from above,' we infer that good motives cannot come but from Him, 'who worketh in us to will as well as to do according to his good pleasure.' The man 'dead in trespasses and sins,' must have life given him from above, before he

can walk in newness of life, and do what is well pleasing in God's sight.

Having thus considered the principal objections, we may now proceed to prove our propositions.

I. And first; 'Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of His Spirit, are not pleasing to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith.'

The language concerning the new birth may come in here. John iii. 3: 'Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God:' the language of Our Lord to His disciples, John xv. 5, 'Without Me ye can do nothing:' and the language of St. Paul concerning the state of the unregenerate and carnal mind, 'In me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing,' Rom. vii. 18. 'The carnal mind is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God,' Rom. viii. 7, 8. All these and many similar passages were considered at length under Article IX.; and they surely prove that the natural man, without the aid of God, cannot bring forth fruits which are pleasing to God. As our Lord says expressly, 'Abide in Me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in Me,' John xv. 4.¹

But, moreover, as it is taught us that the source of all true holiness is faith, so if our good works do not spring from faith, they cannot be pleasing to God. Thus, 'without faith it is impossible to please God,' Heb. xi. 6. 'The just shall live by faith,' Rom. i. 18. Nay! we are even told that 'whatsoever is not of faith is sin,' Rom. xii. 23; and that evidently, because apparently good works, if not springing from a good source, are not really good.

Hence the statement of our Article seems fully borne out,

¹ The reader may refer to what was said under Art. x. on Free Will.

that ‘works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of His Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith.’

II. The second proposition follows from the first ; viz. that works done without grace, do not make men meet to receive grace *de congruo*.

If they are not acceptable to God, it is manifest that they cannot procure grace from Him. It is true that ‘the Law of the Lord is an undefiled law, converting the soul ;’ and that he who strives earnestly to fulfil God’s commandments may always expect to have his exertions assisted by fuller supplies of the grace of God¹. But this is because God loves to reward His grace in us by farther gifts of that grace—because all those earnest strivings are, in themselves, proofs of the Spirit of God working in us. Good works are in no degree to be under-rated ; and the more a man does of them, the more he is likely to gain strength to do more.

This is the regular course of growth in grace. Even naturally, good habits are acquired by performing good actions : and spiritually, those that use the grace of God find it increasing in them. But this is quite a distinct view of the case from that taken by the maintainers of congruous merit. Their doctrine is, that a man without any help from God, and by a strong effort of his own will, can so fulfil the commandments, as, though not of actual right, yet, on a certain principle of congruity, to draw down the grace of God upon him. Scripture, on the contrary, seems to teach that every attempt of this kind is displeasing, as being the result of arrogance and self-sufficiency. The Pharisees, who thought themselves not blind, are told that that was the very cause of their condemnation, whereas, if they

¹ On this principle it is that “If any man will do the will of God, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God,” Joh. vii. 17. “God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble,” 1-Pet. v. 5.

were aware of their own weakness, they should receive their sight. 'If ye were blind, ye should have no sin; but now ye say, We see; therefore your sin remaineth' (John ix. 41). The Jews are spoken of as cast off and blinded, because they sought to find their way to God, and to attain to righteousness, through the works of the Law, and through their own righteousness, instead of by the faith of Christ (see Rom. ix. 30, 31); for they 'were ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, they did not submit themselves to the righteousness of God' (Rom. x. 3).

III. The Article concludes by saying, that forasmuch as such works 'are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but that they have the nature of sin.'

Works done in self-righteousness, done with a view to justify ourselves by our own merits, are not done as God hath willed, but in a wrong spirit and temper; and therefore, proceeding from a bad principle, must be bad. There may be in such works a mixture, as there often is, of good with the bad motive. This God alone can see, and will approve the good, whilst He disapproves the bad. Many a person tries to do right, acting in ignorance, and on the principle that such a mode of action is what God has appointed, and what He will reward. Such a person may have very imperfect knowledge of the truth, and may not be sufficiently aware of his own weakness, and his own need of Divine strength. But mixed with such errors, there may be pure principles of faith and desire to serve God; and God, who sees the heart, may give more blessing to such a person, than to many a better instructed Christian. The Article, however, may be quite right, notwithstanding, in saying that works, not springing from grace, and not done in faith, have the nature of sin. As a general proposition, it is true that 'whatever is not of faith is sin.' And

the spirit, which leads a man, instead of relying on God's mercy in Christ, and seeking the aid of His Spirit, to rely on his own unassisted efforts, is also sin. It is a virtual denial of human infirmity, of the Atonement of Christ, and of the need of the Spirit.

Again, the only thing, which makes good works to be good, is the fact that God has commanded them. Hence, if we find them not done in the way and for the end to which God has ordained them, we are justified in saying that they are not good works, but bad works. The passages quoted from the Homilies in the former section shew sufficiently that this was what the reformers meant by the words of the Article.

ARTICLE XIV.

Of Works of Supererogation.

VOLUNTARY works, besides over and above God's commandments, which they call Works of Supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety: for by them men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for His sake, than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants.

De operibus Supererogationis.

OPERA, quæ supererogationis appellant, non possunt sine arrogantia, et impietate prædicari. Nam illis declarant homines, non tantum se Deo reddere, quæ tenentur, sed plus in ejus gratiam facere, quàm deberent, cum apertè Christus dicat: Cum feceritis omnia quæcunque præcepta sunt vobis dicite, servi inutiles sumus.

SECTION I.

HISTORY.

THERE is nothing in the earliest fathers which bears much on the subject of this Article, unless it be that they appear to have attached more than due importance to martyrdom. Thus the baptism of blood was considered equivalent to baptism by water; and some, perhaps, appear to have ascribed merit to it, such as to cancel sins. Hermas, for instance, speaks of the martyrs as having 'all their offences blotted out, because they have suffered death for the name of the Son of God¹.' And again says of them, when compared with the rest of the redeemed, that they have 'some glory above the others².' And

¹ Simil. ix. 29.

² Vis. iii. 28.

so Tertullian says, that ‘all sins are forgiven to martyrdom¹.’ But with reference to the last-named writer, it has been clearly shewn that, with all his high esteem for martyrdom, he expressly maintained that it was impossible for martyrs to have an excess of holiness above what was required, as not being in themselves sinless. It was the custom in his days, for persons who had lapsed in persecution, to be restored to the communion of the Church, at the intercession of martyrs and confessors; a custom which was often much abused. Writing on this subject, Tertullian says, ‘Who but the Son of God can by His own death relieve others from death? He, indeed, delivered the thief at the very moment of His passion; for He had come for this very end, that, being Himself free from sin and perfectly holy, He might die for sinners. You then, who imitate Christ in pardoning sins, if you are yourselves sinless, suffer death for me. But if you are yourself a sinner, how can the oil out of your cruise suffice both for you and me²?’

In this admiration, however, of the early Church for martyrdom, and in the admission of the intercession of the martyrs for the deliverance of others from church-censures, we may perhaps trace the germ of the doctrine of works of supererogation³.

In the respect which they paid to virginity we may find another source for the same error; for it is well known that they gave the fullest latitude to those words of our Lord and

¹ Omnia huic operi delicta donantur. *Apol. sub fin.*

² *De Pudicitia*, Cap. 22. See Bp. Kaye, Tertullian, p. 336.

Like this is the language of Augustine, quoted by Bp. Beveridge on this Article: Etsi fratres pro fratribus moriantur, tamen in peccatorum remissionem nullius sanguis martyris funditur, quod fecit Ille (i. e. Dominus Christus) pro nobis. August. in *Joh. tract.* 84.

³ *Rogare legem*, to propose a law. *Erogare*, to make a law for paying a sum of money out of a public treasury. So the word is used for lending or paying out. Hence *supererogare*, to pay over and above. In Luke x. 35, προσδαπανάω is in the Vulgate *supererogo*, to spend more. Hey, Vol. III. p. 403.

of St. Paul, in which they speak of celibacy as a favourable state of life for the developement of Christian graces, and for devotion to the service of the Cross.

On this subject especially St. Paul writes, 'Concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord; yet I give my advice' (1 Cor. vii. 25); *De virginibus autem præceptum Domini non habeo, sed consilium do*. From this expression it was very early inferred, that the Scriptures made a distinction between *precepts*, which are binding on all men, and *counsels*, which it is desirable to follow, but which are not obligatory on the conscience. Thus St. Cyprian, speaking of celibacy, says, 'The Lord does not command this, but exhorts to it. He lays not on a yoke of necessity, when the free choice of the will remains. But whereas he says, that in His Father's house are many mansions, He points out the way to the better mansions¹.' St. Augustine writes, 'It is not said, Thou shalt not marry, as it is said, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill. The latter are exacted, the former is offered. If the one is observed, there is praise. If the other is neglected, there will be condemnation².' And St. Jerom distinguishes between a precept and a counsel, as that the one involves necessity of obedience, the other leaves a liberty of accepting or refusing³.

¹ Ned hoc jubet Dominus sed hortatur: nec jugum necessitatis imponit, quando maneat voluntatis arbitrium liberum. Sed cum habitationes multas apud Patrem suum dicat, melioris habitaculi hospitia demonstrat: habitacula ista meliora vos petitis, carnis desideria castrantes, majoris præmium in cœlestibus obtinetis. Cypr. *de Habitu Virginum*, p. 102.

² Non enim sicut *Non mœchaberis, non occides*, ita dici potest. Non nubes. Illa exiguntur, ista offeruntur. Si fiant ista, laudantur; nisi fiunt illa, damnantur. In illis Dominus debitum imperat vobis; in his autem si quid amplius supererogaveritis, in redeundo reddet vobis. August. *De Sancta Virginitate*, cap. 30. *Opera*, Tom. vi. p. 355.

³ Ubi consilium, ibi offerentis arbitrium, ubi præceptum datum ibi necessitas est servientis. Hieron. ad Eustochium, *De Servanda Virginitate*. So in the Sermons *de Tempore*, ascribed to Augustine, Serm. LXI. *De Virginitate* dicitur, Qui potest capere, capiat. De justitia non dicitur Qui potest facere, sed omnis arbor, quæ non facit fructum bonum, excin-

The distinction thus early made may have had a legitimate foundation in Holy Writ. But, in process of time, there grew out of it the doctrine of works of supererogation, as connected with a belief in the merits of martyrdom, and of voluntary celibacy. The increase of monasticism, and the increasing respect paid to every kind of ascetic observance, cherished this belief. In the language of the Confession of Augsburg, ‘The monks taught, that their mode of life was a state of perfection, because they observed not precepts only, but counsels also. This error is greatly at variance with Gospel truth; for thus they pretended so to satisfy the commands of God as even to exceed them. And hence arose the grievous error, that they claimed merits of supererogation. These they applied to others, that they might be satisfactions for other men’s sins¹.’

The full-grown form of the doctrine was, that a man may not only keep the law of God, so as to do all that is actually enjoined on him, but may be so full of the grace of God as even to do more than God’s law enjoins, and thereby deserve even more than his own salvation. This excess of merit, which was supposed to be attained by some of the greater saints, formed a deposit which was entrusted to the Church, and which the Roman pontiff, the vicar of Christ, could, for reasonable causes, by the power of the keys, unlock, and grant to the faithful, in the way of indulgences, and for the remission of temporal punishment.

In the Council of Trent, the last decrees read and approved

detur, et in ignem mittetur. See these and some other passage quoted by Bellarmine, *De Monachis*, Lib. II. Cap. 7, 11. Tom. II. pp. 363, 380.

The words of S. Chrysostom are much to this purpose in Rom. viii.: οἱ πνευματικοὶ πάντα πράττουσιν ἐπιθυμία καὶ πόθῳ, καὶ τοῦτο δηλοῦσι τῷ καὶ υπερβαίνειν τὰ ὑποτάγματα. Thus rendered by Bp. Jer. Taylor, “Spiritual men do their actions with much passion and holy zeal, and give testimony of it by expressing it in the uncommanded instances.” *Rule of Conscience*, II. 3. 12; which see.

¹ *Sylloge*, p. 223.

were concerning the granting of indulgences. The council anathematized those who said they were unprofitable, and, though forbidding their sale and other abuses, yet commanded that they should be retained as profitable for Christian people¹. There is no express mention of works of supererogation.

It is scarcely necessary to add, that all the reformed Churches and sects, of whatever class or denomination, have rejected the doctrine of the Romanists concerning works of supererogation.

¹ Sarpi, p. 757.

SECTION II.

SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

THE principal arguments in favour of the doctrine of the Roman Church on this subject may be found in the writings of Cardinal Bellarmine, in the second book of his treatise *De Monachis*. He assumes the principle, a principle which rightly understood need not be controverted, that in some passages of Scripture advice is given, where there is not a positive command : and then he infers that, ‘ as our Lord distinguishes counsels from precepts, He plainly shews, that men justified by the grace of God can, not only fulfil the law, but even do some works most pleasing to God, which have not been commanded’.¹

Now this inference may fairly be considered a *petitio principii* ; for advice, when coming from our Lord or His Apostles, may be a counsel tending indeed to spiritual good, but yet, if followed, not enabling to do more than is commanded, but only putting in the road to obtain more grace and strength from above.

Bellarmino, besides referring to several passages of the fathers, some of which have been already quoted, brings forward very many texts of Scripture to prove his position. The greater number of these appear so little relevant, that I shall make no apology for considering those only which appear to have some weight.

1 The first, which we may mention, is the counsel given by our Lord to the man who came to Him, and asked, ‘ Good Master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal

¹ *Controvers. General. Lib. iv. De Indulgentiis, Tom. III. p. 1124.* Dominus consilia a præceptis distinguens, ostendit posse homines justificados per gratiam Dei non solum implere legem, sed etiam aliqua alia opera Deo gratissima facere, quæ imperata non sint. He quotes especially the case of the young man, Matt. xix. 16, &c.

life?' Our Lord first replies, 'Keep the commandments.' The young man then says, that he has kept all these from his youth, and adds, 'What lack I yet?' Jesus said unto him, 'If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come and follow Me¹.' Bellarmine argues, that this last sentence of our Lord's could not have been a command, but was a counsel of perfection, which, if obeyed, would have been more than was the young man's duty, *i. e.* a work of supererogation. This he proves as follows: It was not a precept; for to the question, 'What shall I do that I may have eternal life?' the answer is, 'If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.' Therefore the keeping the commandments would be sufficient for salvation. And the advice afterwards given tended to perfection, not to salvation².'

¹ Matt. xix. 16—21.

² Lib. II. *De Monachis*, cap. 9, Tom. II. p. 368, &c.

The cardinal replies to many arguments which have been brought against his interpretation of this history: *e. g.* St Jerom and Bede considered the young man's question as a tempting of our Lord, but Chrysostom refutes this opinion, by shewing that none of the Evangelists blame him, and Bellarmine adds, that St Mark (x. 21), says that "Jesus beholding him loved him." Calvin (*Inst.* Lib. iv. cap. 13) had argued that our Lord could not have placed perfection in selling all things, since in 1 Cor. xiii. 3, we read "though I give all my goods to feed the poor . . . and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." Calvin also observes, that the young man could not really have kept all the commandments, for one is, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, &c. ;' and he who does this will give up every thing, and therefore, of course, all his wealth, for Him. Peter Martyr too had said, that it could not be a counsel but a precept, when our Lord said, 'If thou wilt be perfect, sell all that thou hast;' for in Matt. v. 48, 'Be ye perfect' is a precept; and therefore whatever teaches us to be perfect must be of the nature of a precept also.

To this Bellarmine tries to reply, that there are different kinds of perfection, some necessary for salvation, but a higher degree for a higher grade of glory. P. Martyr also says, that this command was given to the young man alone, and that therefore it was necessary for his perfection, but not for every one's, for he is perfect who obeys God's laws. Bellar-

But if we attentively consider the whole conversation, we shall see that this interpretation will not satisfy the case. In the first place, the young man asks, 'What good thing he should do to have eternal life;' to which our Lord gives the general reply, that, 'if he would be saved, he must keep the commandments.' The young man, evidently not ill disposed (see Mark x. 21), but with an undue notion of his own strength and goodness, then says that he has kept all the commandments from his youth, and, as though he could see no deficiency in his own conduct, asks again, 'What lack I yet?' Now it was to this question, 'What lack I?' that our Lord gave the reply now under consideration. That reply, therefore, was intended to shew the young man what he *lacked*: and if he lacked something, it is quite clear, that the supplying of that lack, or deficiency, could not be a work of supererogation, but a work of duty or obligation. This is further proved by the conduct of the young man, who, when he had heard our Lord's reply, 'went away sorrowful.' That is to say, he felt not able and willing to do what our Lord had said was needful for him to do. He had asked what was necessary for his salvation. The first answer gave him satisfaction; for it did not fully convince him of his weakness. The second probed him to the quick, and shewed him that the strength of purpose, which he supposed himself to possess, was not such as to lead him to renounce all for the kingdom of God. And so when he had gone away sorrowful, our Lord does not say, A rich man shall hardly become perfect, or do works of supererogation; but He says, 'Verily I say unto you, that a rich man shall hardly *enter into the kingdom of Heaven*. And again I say unto you, It is easier

mine answers, No! The command was, 'If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments;' this was addressed to all. So we ought to infer that the saying, 'If thou wilt be perfect, sell all that thou hast,' was equally addressed to all. He quotes Ambrose, Jerom, and Augustine, as agreeing with him in this view.

for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to *enter into the kingdom of God.* It was unfitness for the kingdom of Heaven, not unfitness for a supereminent degree of glory, which the rich man shewed, when, at our Lord's bidding, he could not sell all that he had.

Whence it appears that this saying of our Lord's was a precept, and not a counsel. It was like the command given to Abraham to kill his son. It was a trial of his faith, and of his readiness to obey. The faithful servant of God will give up all, even that he loves the best, for Him whom he serves. Abraham's dearest treasure was his son, and he was ready to sacrifice him. The young man's treasure was his wealth, and he went away sorrowful. The one was shewn to be true and firm in the faith. The other's faith was proved to be doubtful and wavering.

Bellarmino, however, farther contends that, whereas it follows in the 27th verse, 'Peter answered and said unto Him, Behold we have forsaken all, and followed Thee; what shall we have therefore?' if the command was only given to the young man, and not to all men; then our Lord would have said to Peter, 'I will give nothing to you, I spoke only to this young man;' (*Nihil vobis dabo, nam soli illi juveni loquutus sum*); whereas the answer actually is (*Amen dico vobis, &c.*) 'Verily I say unto you, that ye who have followed Me...shall sit on twelve thrones...and *every one* who hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake, shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life.' The cardinal's conclusion is therefore, that to *all* men it is a *precept*, 'keep the commandments,' and to *all* men it is a *counsel*, 'sell that thou hast, and give to the poor.' The Apostles obeyed the precept and the counsel both, and so did more than their duty; the young man kept only the precepts, and so won Heaven, but not more than Heaven.

There is evidently a fallacy here. No doubt it is not commanded to all men to sell all that they have; for St. Paul

bade Timothy ‘charge those who are rich in this world’ (not to sell their possessions, but) ‘not to trust in uncertain riches,’ ‘to do good, to be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate’ (1 Tim. vi. 17, 18). But though all men are not expressly called to sell all that they have, yet at the time of our Lord’s presence upon earth, He did call all His immediate followers to give up everything for His sake; and the most obvious and decided way of giving proof of zeal for His service and love to Him, was to forsake parents and brethren, house and lands, and to follow Him who had no place to lay His head¹. Thus as Abraham evidenced his faith by being ready to slay his son, so the Apostles evidenced theirs by forsaking their homes; and the rich young man could not find it in his heart to sacrifice so much, because his faith was not so true. Here is no room for works of supererogation, nor even for counsels of perfection.

2 Another of Bellarmine’s proofs² is drawn from 1 Cor. ix.; in which St. Paul asserts that he might have received payment for his ministry, that he might have led about a wife at the expence of the Church; but that he would not do anything of this kind, lest his glorying should be made void. Taking the Latin version as his guide, Bellarmine reasons, that though St. Paul might have fulfilled all his duty, if he had taken payment of the Church, yet he would not take reward, that he might obtain greater glory. And he argues against Peter Martyr (who interprets the *gloriam* of ver. 15 to mean ‘glorying before men’), that St. Augustine had written, *Bonum est magis mihi mori, quam ut gloriam meam quis evacuet. Quam gloriam?*

¹ We must remember that there was a perfectly general precept to this effect: ‘He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me,’ Matt. x. 37. And again: ‘If any man come to me, and hate not his father and mother, and wife and children, and brethren and sisters, **yes,** and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple,’ Luke xiv. 26.

² Tom. ii. p. 378.

*nisi quam habere voluit apud Deum in Christo*¹? But *pace tanti viri*, be it said, that the Greek word is καύχημα, which means *boasting*; and that a greater than St. Augustine has written that ‘no flesh should glory (or boast) in God’s presence².’ The passage in St. Paul can hardly mean anything but this; that, whereas he, as an Apostle, had a right to be chargeable to the Church, he had yet refused to be so, that he might have the more influence for good over those among whom he ministered. As he says in the nineteenth verse of the same chapter, ‘Though he was free from all men, yet he made himself the servant of all, that he might gain the more.’ Thus he was able to boast that he had cost them nothing; and they therefore could not charge him with avarice or private views. To make his glorying in this respect void would have been to deprive him of his influence over them, and therefore of that power to do good, which lay so near his heart.

But the most cogent argument from Scripture, in favour of works of supererogation, is drawn from the passages in which our Lord and St. Paul, whilst highly honouring marriage, yet give the preference to a life of celibacy. The passages in question are Matt. xix. 10, 11, 12, and 1 Cor. vii. *passim*, especially 7, 8, 25—28, 32—40.

On the first passage, Bellarmine observes, that to live a life of celibacy cannot be a precept, because of the high commendation which our Lord had just bestowed upon matrimony, and yet, he says, it is evident that it has a reward in Heaven, because our Lord declares that ‘some have made themselves eunuchs’ (*i. e.* have lived a life of celibacy) ‘for the kingdom of Heaven’s sake,’ and then adds, ‘He that is able to receive it, let him receive it’ (Matt. xix. 12). In like manner, on 1 Cor. vii. he observes, that the advice to abstain from marriage is evi-

¹ *Lib. de Opere Monachorum*, c. 10.

² 1 Cor. i. 29. Comp. Rom. iii. 27; iv. 2. Ephes. ii. 9.

dently a *counsel*; and that it is a counsel of not merely human wisdom, but proceeding from the Spirit of God; which he fully proves from ver. 25, 40; where the Apostle declares that, though there had been ‘no commandment of the Lord,’ yet he gave his judgment as one who had ‘obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful,’ ver. 25; and that in thus giving his judgment, he felt assured that he had the Spirit of God, ver. 40.¹

Luther, he says, only admitted a temporal advantage to be attached to celibacy, and such has been the exposition of many Protestants; viz. that so a man may escape cares, and anxieties, and *that* especially in time of persecution. Against such Bellarmine quotes the words of St. Augustine²; who truly maintained that the Apostle spoke of spiritual as well as temporal benefits to be derived from celibacy.

From Luther, Bellarmine passes to Melancthon, who went farther than Luther, and admitted that some spiritual good might be derived from an unmarried state, such as more freedom and time for prayer and preaching³. But to the temporal benefits admitted by Luther, and to the spiritual benefits allowed by Melancthon, Bellarmine adds a third, viz. to please God and obtain greater reward. He observes that the words *propter instantem necessitatem*, ‘because of the present distress’ (ver. 26), do not mean that we may escape present troubles, but that they rather mean, *propter brevitatem temporis*, ‘because of the shortness of the time;’ as it is said (ver. 29), ‘But this I say, brethren, the time is short.’ Against Melancthon he says, that in ver. 34 the Apostle commends the state of an unmarried

¹ “ Δοκῶ δὲ καὶ γὰρ Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἔχειν, where, according to the well-known usage of St. Paul and others, δοκεῖν is far from implying doubt.

² *De Sancta Virginitate*, c. 13. Unde mirabiliter desipiunt, qui putant hujus continentiae bonum non esse necessarium propter regnum cœlorum, sed propter præsens sæculum, quod scilicet conjugia terrenis curis pluribus atque arctioribus distenduntur, qua molestia virgines et continentes carent, &c.

³ In locis, cap. de Castitate.

female, saying, that ‘she careth for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit;’ and that this shews that virginity has of itself a sanctity both of body and spirit, according to the words of Jerom (lib. i. *Contra Jovinian*): *Illa virginitas hostia Christi est, cujus nec mentem cogitatio, nec carnem libido maculant*. From ver. 35, where St. Paul says, he speaks thus ‘for that which is comely,’ *ad id quod honestum est*, Bellarmine argues that the apostle calls continence a thing *per se honestam et decoram et proinde Deo charam*, ‘a thing in its own nature comely and honourable, and therefore dear to God.’ And again, in ver. 40, the words ‘She is happier if she so abide,’ he says, plainly mean, she will be happier in the world to come¹.

Now, in this reasoning of the distinguished Romanist divine, there appears a considerable mixture of truth and error. Let us admit, as we cannot doubt, that the Apostle wrote under the guidance of the Spirit; let us admit, that he gave a *counsel*, not a *precept*; for plainly it is no commandment of God that men should not marry, but only that they should ‘abstain from fornication.’ Let us admit, that both our blessed Lord and St. Paul spoke of abstaining from marriage, for the sake of some advantages which an unmarried life has, as regards spiritual employments and spiritual meditations. The divines of our own communion have admitted this as freely as those of the Roman Church². There seems no reason to doubt that both our Lord and St. Paul speak of some to whom a peculiar gift has been given, and who can, by living unmarried, devote themselves more unreservedly to the work of the Gospel, and

¹ Beatior autem erit, si sic permanserit, id est, ut exponit, in futuro sæculo. Bellarmine treats of Matt. xix. *Controv. Gener.* Tom. ii. p. 367. Cf. 1 Cor. vii. Tom. ii. p. 373.

² For example, see Bp. Burnet on this Article, and Milner, *Hist. of the Church*, Cent. i. ch. xi.; Cent. ii. ch. viii.; divines of a school peculiarly disinclined from any concessions to the Romanists. On the proper distinction between precepts and counsels, the student may read with great advantage Bp. Jer. Taylor, *Rule of Conscience*, Book ii. ch. iii. Rule 12.

the service of the Lord. Marriage brings with it the anxieties of family and worldly business, and many of those ‘cares of this life,’ which may, if not checked, choke the good seed. From all such celibacy is free. Therefore, though marriage be a state ordained of God, yet some, thinking to give their whole lives to religious employments, have abstained from marriage, ‘have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of Heaven’s sake;’ and such a determination, in such as are ‘able to receive it,’ our Lord has honoured with His sanction, ‘Let him receive it.’ And so it is with the counsel of St. Paul. He tells us, that ‘the time is short, it remaineth that they that have wives be as though they had none....that they who use this world, be as though they used it not¹; for the fashion of this world passeth away.’ Accordingly, to such as have the gift of continence he gives his advice, that it may help them on more in their course of godliness, if they continue to live a life less burdened with the cares of this world, than is the life of those who are united in marriage. Such a life is not indeed to be commended to all men, and the Apostle carefully guards himself against forcing the conscience, or ‘casting a snare upon’ them. But it is a life which has many advantages. The unmarried have nothing to do but care for the things of the Lord; whilst the married cannot but be anxious to please, not only God, but the partner of their earthly pilgrimage. Much therefore as there is of blessing in the married state, honourable as it is in all men, and a *κοίτη ἀμίαντος*, a state undefiled; still those who have contracted it are, like Martha, necessarily ‘cumbered about much serving;’ whilst the unmarried, like Mary, have more leisure to ‘sit at the feet of Jesus,’ able to ‘attend upon the Lord without distraction².’ Therefore it is that the Apostle

¹ 1 Cor. vii. 31: ‘As though they used it not,’ ὡς μὴ καταχρώμενοι. *Katachrôsthai* here probably signifies to use. Comp. 1 Cor. vii. 31; ix. 18.

² 1 Cor. vii. 35. In the words πρὸς τὸ εὐπρόσεδρον τῷ Κυρίῳ ἀπερισπάστως, it has been thought, that St. Paul especially alludes to Mary’s ‘sitting at Jesus’ feet.’ Luke x. 39.

counsels an unmarried life, because of ‘the present distress;’ because, it may be, of the distress and anxieties of this present life, which are much unfavourable to the attainment of holiness, and which especially beset those who are tied in the bond of matrimony¹.

This exposition will fairly satisfy the language both of Christ and of His Apostle. But we deny that St. Paul, when instituting a comparison between marriage and celibacy, speaks of the latter as having more merit than the former; or that the one shall ensure a higher place in Heaven than the other. It may be to some persons a state more favourable for growth in grace, though, for obvious reasons, it may be a snare to others. But, as marriage is a thing holy in itself, so we do not learn that celibacy is holier. ‘One is not a better chastity than the other. Marriage is a *κοίτη ἀμίαντος*, an undefiled state, and nothing can be cleaner than that which is not at all unclean².’ And therefore, though we fully admit the honour due to a holy celibacy, we yet deny that it has any merit at all, as nothing in man can merit from God; and still more do we deny that it can have merit of supererogation³.

¹ Propter instantem necessitatem.] Id est præsentis vitæ sollicitudinem, quæ multum potest obesse justitiæ, et qua præcipue juncti matrimonii implicantur.—Hieron. in 1 Cor. vii.

² Jer. Taylor, as above.

³ A passage, not noticed by Bellarmine, may seem to countenance the doctrine, that the sufferings of the saints were beneficial, not only to themselves, but to the Church; and that therefore their merits were more than enough for their own salvation. The passage is Col. i. 24, ‘Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body’s sake, which is the Church.’ But, if we carefully consider the passage, we cannot suppose that the Apostle means that there was anything deficient in the sufferings of Christ, or that His infinite merits needed addition from the sufferings of His servant. The true meaning of the passage is this: Every servant of Christ has need to be conformed to the likeness of the sufferings of his Lord. St. Paul considered that there was somewhat lacking in him, that there was somewhat yet ‘behind of the affliction of Christ,’ before he could be thoroughly conformed to His likeness; and earnestly desiring to be made

the service of the Lord. Marriage brings with it the influence of family and worldly business, and many of those 'importunities of life,' which may, if not checked, choke the good seed, and such celibacy is free. Therefore, though marriage is the ordinance of God, yet some, thinking to give more maintenance to religious employments, have abstained from it. It remains to be seen whether the Scriptures are inconsistent in such a determination, in such as are our Lord has honoured with His sanction. And so it is with the counsel of St. Paul, 'the time is short, it remaineth that they though they had none....that they will though they used it not'; for the flesh is away.' Accordingly, to such as have given his advice, that it may help them of godliness, if they continue to live in the cares of this world, than is the blessing of marriage. Such a life is not in the men, and the Apostle carefully examines the conscience, or 'casting a life which has many advantages to do but care for the things cannot but be anxious to put off of their earthly pilgrimage, blessing in the married state, and a *κοίτη ἀμάρτος*. Those who have contracted it are, like those who are much serving;' whilst they have leisure to 'sit at the feet of the Lord without distraction.

1 1 Cor. ~~12-14~~ -
καταρχῆς

profitable servants : we have
do' (Luke xvii. 10). What
sine which teaches, that a man
and attain to glory by keeping
observing counsels may merit still
keep all the precepts, we should be
ht to reward, but merely to exemp-
Something more than obedience to
n for salvation ; and where then is the
build still higher merit ?

parable of the ten virgins, when the five
their oil fail, they are represented as going
s, and asking to borrow oil from them. But
ed that they had not enough for themselves and
wing that no one can have holiness or grace
ply another's deficiencies, but that each one must
and grace for himself (Matt. xxv. 9).

n the precepts of the Gospel are so full and com-
that everything, even the highest degree of perfec-
contained in them. Under the Law, indeed, if the
ly was observed, the statutes contained but a certain
catalogue of duties : but the spiritual sense of the
as enforced by our Saviour, enjoins such an entire sur-
of all the faculties of the body, soul, and spirit, to the
ice of Christ, that nothing conceivable can exceed or over-

¹ Quod sub præcepto est, si non impleatur, punit. Impletum morte
entum caret; quia nihil ex se dat, sed quod debet, exsolvit.—Hieron. in
Cor. vii.

It is true that the divines of the Roman communion always presuppose
that it is the atonement of Christ which gives efficacy and merit to the
works of the saints. But we must remember that our Lord, in the
passage from Luke xvii. 10, spoke to His own disciples—those very saints
who are supposed not only to have merited life, but to have laid up
a store of good works, more than was needed for their salvation.

The above are the only arguments from Scripture, adduced by Bellarmine, which can be considered as of weight or importance; and we may therefore fairly consider that, in answering them, we have shewn that Scripture does not countenance the doctrine which our fourteenth Article condemns. It remains to shew, that there are passages and statements in the Scriptures directly at variance with that doctrine, and utterly inconsistent with it.

1 In the first place, Scripture shews that all men, even those under the dominion of grace, are still imperfect and full of infirmity. David says, that ‘there is none that doeth good, no not one’ (Ps. xiv. 3); St. James says, that ‘in many things we offend all’ (Jam. iii. 2); and St. John says, that ‘if we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves’ (1 John i. 8). But if it be true, that all men have sinned, and ‘in many things offend,’ then it is quite clear that no man can be so perfectly holy as not only to fulfil all God’s law, but even to exceed it. And as the Psalmist spoke, in the fourteenth Psalm, ‘to those that were under the Law’ (see Rom. iii. 10, 19), so St. James and St. John evidently spoke to those who were under grace; as the whole context evinces. Hence we must conclude that, even under grace, no man lives actually spotless in God’s commandments.

2 But even if we could live wholly without spot, and never offend in thought, word, or deed, even so our Lord teaches us, that such a spotless obedience would still leave us undeserving of reward. ‘When ye shall have done all those things which

like his Lord, he gladly took every additional trial as only bringing him nearer to His image; and all these trials he endured for the sake of the Church, which he served, and to which he preached the Gospel of Christ. There is no mention of vicarious suffering on the part of St. Paul, of supererogatory merit, or of addition to the full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice of Christ upon the cross.

are commanded you, say, *We are unprofitable servants : we have done that which was our duty to do* ' (Luke xvii. 10). What room is there then for the doctrine which teaches, that a man may do enough for his salvation and attain to glory by keeping the precepts ; and then by observing counsels may merit still more ? Even if we could keep all the precepts, we should be unprofitable, having no right to reward, but merely to exemption from punishment¹. Something more than obedience to precepts is required, even for salvation ; and where then is the foundation on which to build still higher merit ?

3 Again, in the parable of the ten virgins, when the five foolish virgins found their oil fail, they are represented as going to the wise virgins, and asking to borrow oil from them. But the wise answered that they had not enough for themselves and others too, shewing that no one can have holiness or grace enough to supply another's deficiencies, but that each one must seek pardon and grace for himself (Matt. xxv. 9).

4 Then the precepts of the Gospel are so full and comprehensive, that everything, even the highest degree of perfection, is contained in them. Under the Law, indeed, if the letter only was observed, the statutes contained but a certain express catalogue of duties : but the spiritual sense of the Law, as enforced by our Saviour, enjoins such an entire surrender of all the faculties of the body, soul, and spirit, to the service of Christ, that nothing conceivable can exceed or over-

¹ Quod sub præcepto est, si non impleatur, punit. Impletum mortis tantum caret ; quia nihil ex se dat, sed quod debet, exsolvit.—Hieron. in 1 Cor. vii.

It is true that the divines of the Roman communion always presuppose that it is the atonement of Christ which gives efficacy and merit to the works of the saints. But we must remember that our Lord, in the passage from Luke xvii. 10, spoke to His own disciples—those very saints who are supposed not only to have merited life, but to have laid up a store of good works, more than was needed for their salvation.

pass it. This will be quite apparent, if we read our Lord's exposition of the Law, in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 27, seq.); where a thought or a look of evil is deadly sin; or His declaration, that no one can be His disciple who hates not his nearest friends and his own life, if need be, for Christ's service; or His summary of the commandments—unbounded love to God, and perfect love to man (Matt. xxii. 37, 38, 39): 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind; and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' We cannot conceive either saint or angel more perfect than this: and yet all this is *commanded*—is of the nature of a *precept*, not of counsels only. The language of St. Paul's exhortations are equally strong; that we present ourselves 'as living sacrifices to God' (Rom. xii. 1), that we 'cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, *perfecting* holiness in the fear of God' (2 Cor. vii. 1). 'Finally, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things' (Phil. iv. 8). Can anything go beyond these things, which it is our duty to do? But if any man seem to be contentious, St. Peter tells us, as a plain command, to aim 'to be holy as Christ is holy' (1 Pet. i. 15, 16): and Christ Himself concludes his teaching concerning the strict and spiritual nature of the Law, with the words, 'Be ye therefore perfect, as your Father which is in heaven is perfect' (Matt. v. 48). Till then we can learn that God's grace has ever made man as perfect as God, we can never believe that man has ever fully lived up to the *precepts* of the Gospel. Where is the room for higher graces still?

5 Lastly, we may observe, that the whole of the doctrine of works of supererogation arises from a false view of the principle of Christian obedience. If we look for merit, it must be

to Christ. Christian obedience is not a task of so much work to be done, and so much reward to be expected. When it is sound and perfect, it springs from a true faith and a holy love. And, as no degree of perfection can excel the obedience which would be yielded by perfect love, so nothing can excel that holiness at which every Christian is bound to aim. The obedience of the Gospel is not the task-work of a slave, but the perfect freedom of a son.

ARTICLE XV.

Of Christ alone without Sin.

CHRIST in the truth of our nature was made like unto us in all things, sin only except; from which He was clearly void, both in His flesh and in His Spirit. He came to be the Lamb without spot, who, by sacrifice of Himself once made, should take away the sins of the world; and sin (as St John saith) was not in Him. But all we the rest, although baptized and born again in Christ, yet offend in many things; and if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

De Christo, qui solus est sine peccato.

CHRISTUS, in nostræ nature veritate, per omnia similis factus est nobis, excepto peccato a quo prorsus erat immunis, tum in carne, tum in Spiritu. Venit ut Agnus, absque macula, qui mundi peccata per immolationem sui semel factam, tolleretur, et peccatum (ut inquit Joannes) in eo non erat: sed nos reliqui etiam baptizati, et in Christo regenerati, in multis tamen offendimus omnes. Et si dixerimus, quia peccatum non habemus, nos ipsos seducimus, et veritas in nobis non est.

SECTION I.

HISTORY.

THE history of the greater part of the doctrine contained in this Article may be considered as involved in the history of some of the preceding Articles, especially of the ninth. We spoke there of the Pelagian heresy, and observed that Pelagius held that it was possible for a man, even without the grace of God, to keep God's law, and live a life of perfect holiness. St. Augustine, we saw, in his arguments against Pelagianism, still expressed unwillingness to discuss the question of the sinfulness of the blessed Virgin Mary, out of reverence to her Son and Lord. Pelagius had held that it was necessary for our religion that we should confess the Virgin to be sinless (*i. e.* that we might not hold our Saviour to be born in sin). St. Augustine

answers, 'Concerning the Virgin Mary, I am not willing, for the honour of our Lord, to hold any dispute, when we are talking about sin. For how do we know what more grace was bestowed on her to overcome all sin; who had the honour to conceive and bring forth Him, who certainly had no sin¹?'

This scruple, which early prevailed about the Virgin, in the course of years grew into a doctrine. But for a length of time the doctrine was privately held, not publicly expressed. In the year 1136, the Canons of Lyons brought the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin into the ecclesiastical offices; for which act of rashness they were severely censured by St. Bernard. But about the year 1300, the celebrated schoolman, John Duns Scotus, a Franciscan friar, strenuously maintained the total exemption from sin of the Blessed Virgin, and grounded it upon the Omnipotency of God, who could free her from sin if He chose. Thenceforward, the Scotists and Franciscans ever advocated the dogma of the Immaculate Conception².

At the Council of Trent this question was hotly debated: the Franciscans exempting the Virgin from all taint of sin, the Dominicans labouring to comprehend her name under the common law. The pope commanded that the contention on the subject should be omitted, for fear of causing a schism. Both parties acquiesced in silence, on the condition, that when the decrees were made, it should merely be added, that there was no intention to include the Blessed Virgin in the decrees concerning original sin³. It was therefore left an open question;

¹ August. *De Natura et Gratia*. Wall, *Inf. Bapt.* Vol. i. p. 404. The passage from Augustine is from c. 42. Tom. x. p. 144:

Excepta itaque sancta virgine Maria, de qua propter honorem Domini nullam prorsus cum de peccatis agitur, haberi volo quæstionem. Unde enim scimus, quid ei plus gratiæ collatum fuerit ad vincendum omni ex parte peccatum? &c.

² Sarpi, *Council of Trent*, p. 178.

³ Sarpi, pp. 164, 169, 171.

although the Franciscans had the better reason of the two parties to be satisfied.

It was also decreed in the Council of Trent, that all the taint of original sin is washed away in baptism¹. And the Lutherans were condemned for saying that God's commands were not possible to the just². From these canons of the council it might naturally follow, that a person baptized and justified may fully keep God's commands, and live a life of spotless holiness. But what is even more to the purpose still, is the Romish doctrine of works of supererogation. For, if such works are possible, it must first be possible that he who does them should be perfectly sinless. Otherwise he could not do, not only his duty, but more than his duty. Accordingly this Article of our Church, 'Of Christ alone without sin,' follows immediately on that concerning Works of Supererogation. The one is very probably intended as a supplement and strengthener to the other: so that, whereas in the last Article it was said that no man can do more than God's law requires, so in this it is added, that no man in this life can fully live up to its requirements, but *all* offend many times; and none, even of the baptized and regenerate, is quite free from sin.

That part of the Article which alleges that Christ was free from sin, need not be considered historically, for none but those who deny His Divinity can deny His sinlessness. And the greatest heretics, even mere Humanitarians, have respected the Saviour as a pure and holy Being.

¹ Sess. v. Canon 5.

² Sess. vi. Can. 18.

SECTION II.

SCRIPTURAL PROOF.

THE subjects treated on in the Article are,

I. That Christ was without sin, although in all other things made like unto us.

II. That all other men (even though baptized and born again in Christ) yet offend in many things.

I. That Christ, though perfect man, was yet free from sin, properly forms a part of the doctrine of the Incarnation, and is therefore intimately connected with Article II.

The eternal Son of God, the second Person in the Godhead, took into that Person the perfect nature of man. That nature of man had become defiled and debased. And it was that He might purify and restore it, that He took it into Himself. But the question is, whether, when He took the nature, He was obliged to take its corruption with it. If so, we may well believe that the Incarnation would have been impossible. God is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity. Much less can we suppose that God would take iniquity and corruption to Himself, into union with His own spotless purity and holiness.

But though human nature, in all naturally engendered of Adam, is stained with the sin of Adam, yet sin is not a *part* of human nature, but a *fault* of it¹. The Manicheans held that matter was essentially evil, and so human nature was evil,

¹ The Manichees held that sin was a *natura non a culpa*: i. e. because they thought one portion of our nature (i. e. the body) essentially evil. But the fathers taught that it was not τῆς φύσεως, ἀλλὰ τῆς κακῆς προαιρέσεως: 'not of nature, but of an evil determination of the will:' (see History of Art. IX. note.) And our XIth Article teaches, not that it is part of our nature, but 'the fault and corruption of our nature.'

because matter was a part of it. But matter as well as spirit comes from God, and so is of itself, like all His creatures, 'very good.' Sin therefore, which we all inherit, is a corruption and evil addition to our nature, not an essential and integral part of it. Whether it consists in a withdrawal of the indwelling and presence of God, and a consequent rebellion of the lower principles of his nature¹, or whether there be moreover a kind of taint or poison, which, working in him, produces sin and renders him liable to death; in either case original sin is not human nature, but an accident of that nature; a quality as distinct from humanity, as is any particular bodily disease, such as madness, or consumption, or neuralgia.

When therefore Christ took our nature, it was not essential to its perfection that He should take our sinfulness. Sin not being a part, but a fault of nature, He might be 'made in all things like unto us,' even though sin were excepted. Our *liability* to sin indeed He must have taken; for else He could not have been 'in all things tempted like as we are.' Adam had a liability to sin, and therefore was susceptible of temptation before he was actually guilty of sin, and so defiled and corrupted by it. And Christ, who was the second Adam, who came on purpose that He might conquer where Adam had fallen, and so restore that nature, which Adam had debased, was, by the constitution of that nature which He adopted, liable to be assailed by the same dangers that Adam had been assailed by, and, but for His own essential holiness and the supporting power of His Godhead, it was possible that He might have fallen under them. Thus He became a fit representative of our race, as much as Adam was. He had all our

¹ 'Man's corruption consists, first, in the deprivation of the Divine guidance, which he has rejected, for "the light shined in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not;" and secondly, in the correspondent rebellion of the lower principles of his body and his soul.' Wilberforce on *The Incarnation*, p. 74.

nature, with all its natural weaknesses; and all that He lacked, was that which was no proper part of, but only a vicious addition to, our nature, viz. our sin. Nay, He even condescended to take our sicknesses. He was liable to hunger and weariness and death. Many indeed of our sicknesses are the natural results of sin, of gluttony or intemperance, anger or passion. These He, who had no sin, could not have. Yet He took not only human nature, but mortal nature: and though He was too holy to defile Himself with our sin, yet He was not too glorious to submit to our death.

The passages of Scripture which prove this part of the doctrine of the Article are sufficiently numerous and familiar. Thus it is announced to Mary, ‘That *Holy Thing* which shall be born of Thee shall be called the Son of God’ (Luke i. 35). ‘The prince of this world,’ said our Lord, ‘hath nothing in Me’ (John xiv. 30). He was ‘the Holy One, and the just’ (Acts iii. 14). God ‘made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin’ (2 Cor. v. 21). ‘He was in all things tempted like as we are, yet without sin’ (Heb. iv. 15). ‘An High Priest, holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens;’ not like those ‘high priests who have infirmity,’ and needing to ‘offer up sacrifices, first for their own sins, and then for the people’s’ (Heb. vii. 26, 27, 28). He ‘did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth’ (1 Pet. ii. 22). He ‘was manifested to take away our sins, and in Him is no sin’ (1 John iii. 5).

The words of the Article, that ‘He came to be the Lamb without spot,’ are from the following:

‘He was led as a Lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so He openeth not His mouth’ (Isai. liii. 7). ‘The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world’ (John i. 29). ‘Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God’ (Heb. ix. 14).

Redeemed 'with the precious Blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot' (1 Pet. i. 19. Comp. Exod. xii. 5; Lev. xxii. 19, 20, 21).

II. The second part of the Article, that 'all other men offend in many things, even though baptized and born again' has been already considered at some length under the ninth Article. It was there shewn that the taint of sin pervaded the whole human race, and that every one naturally born of Adam was subject to it; that even the regenerate had still remains of such corruption; and that that concupiscence, which still remains in them, has the nature of sin¹.

1 It may be sufficient here to recite a few of the passages of Scripture, on which more especially the proof of this assertion depends.

'If they sin against Thee,' says Solomon; 'for there is no man that sinneth not' (1 Kings viii. 45). 'In Thy sight,' says David, 'shall no man living be justified' (Ps. cxliii. 2). 'Who can say,' asks the wise man, 'I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?' (Prov. xx. 9). 'We have proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin' (Rom. iii. 9). 'Death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned' (Rom. v. 12.) 'The Scripture hath concluded all under sin' (Gal. iii. 22). 'In many things we offend all' (James iii. 2). 'If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us' (1 John i. 8). 'Let not sin reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof' (Rom. vi. 12). 'I had not known sin, but by the Law; for I had not known lust except the Law had said, Thou shalt not covet' (Rom. vii. 7). So 'The flesh lusteth against the Spirit' (Gal. v. 17).

¹ Ἄνθρώπων οὐδεὶς ἀναμάρτητος, ἐνὶ γὰρ μαρτυρεῖται, ὅτι ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησε. Basil. M. Orat. de Pœnitentia. Suicer. i. 207.

These last passages shew that lust or concupiscence hath the nature of sin.

2 The principal objections which may be urged against this part of the doctrine of the Article, are such as the following.

In some passages of Scripture people are called blameless; as (Luke i. 6) Zacharias and Elizabeth are spoken of as 'both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, blameless.' In a like manner St. Paul speaks of himself as having 'lived in all good conscience before God to this day' (Acts xxiii. 1); as exercising himself 'to have a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man' (Acts xxiv. 16); as having been, before his conversion, 'touching the righteousness which is in the Law, blameless' (Phil. iii. 6).

Such passages seem to argue *blameless* perfection. But we may answer, that Zacharias could not have been perfect, or he would not have disbelieved the Angel, when he promised him a son, and so have been smitten with dumbness for his want of faith (Luke i. 20.) St Paul, when he speaks of himself as blameless touching the righteousness of the Law, was a persecutor of the Church, and though he did it ignorantly in unbelief, and so obtained mercy, yet we can hardly consider it as consistent with perfection; and though he speaks of himself as exercising himself to have a conscience void of offence, yet we know that he did 'not count himself to have apprehended,' that he was sensible of 'infirmities' (see 2 Cor. xi. 30; xii. 10, &c); that he felt it necessary to 'keep under his body, and bring it into subjection' (1 Cor. ix. 27.) Nay, we know that he was liable to infirmity, for so sharp a contention rose between him and Barnabas, that they could not continue together in the work of the Gospel, but were obliged to separate one from another. We must therefore understand the word *blameless* in a more popular sense, not as if those, of whom it is predicated, were free from all stain of sin, but as meaning that they lived an upright, godly life, ever striving to keep a conscience free

from offence, and never yielding to those wilful sins, which offend society, or destroy the work of God's grace in the soul, or even give cause of deep and bitter regret to him who yields to them.

Again, it is said of the Christian under grace, that 'the law of the Spirit of life makes him free from the law of sin and death' (Rom. viii. 3, 4). This is true of all good Christians, but it does not mean that they are made perfect and wholly free from sin, but that the Spirit of God sets them free from the *bondage* and *slavery* of sin, and gives them freedom and strength to 'fulfil the righteousness of the Law.'

The same reasoning nearly applies to the words of St John, 'Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin' (1 John iii. 9). This is true of every regenerate man as regards his new nature, the new man created in him. That new man is pure and holy, hating sin and avoiding it. Still however there are the remains of the old man, causing in him those infirmities, which more or less are common to all. A regenerate man does not live in admitted sin. If he does, his new life has failed and is stifled. But, he still 'in many things offends,' and, 'if he says he has no sin, he deceives himself;' because, in this world, the old nature may be kept in subjection and bondage, but is never thoroughly extinguished, until the last enemy has been destroyed, and all things are put in subjection under the feet of Christ.

It is true, we are bid to be holy, as Christ is holy (1 Pet. i. 15); to 'be perfect, as our Father which is in Heaven is perfect' (Matt. v. 48). But we can infer from these exhortations no more than this. It is our part to set before us the highest possible standard at which to aim. Christ took our nature, that He might make us partakers of His nature; and we are never to be satisfied unless we grow daily more and more like to Him. But it does not follow that we shall ever attain to such perfect conformity to His Image, until we become 'like Him, by seeing Him as He is.'

We come, lastly, to consider the case of the Blessed Virgin. That she was a person of most singular holiness, most highly honoured of God, and most affectionately beloved by her Divine Son, no candid reader of Scripture can doubt. The Angel salutes her, 'Hail, thou that art highly favoured¹: the Lord is with thee; Blessed art thou among women' (Luke i. 28). Her cousin Elizabeth saluted her, by the Holy Ghost, saying, 'Blessed art thou among women;' and though she was her near kinswoman, yet wondered at the honour done to herself in that 'the Mother of her Lord should come unto her' (Luke i. 42, 43). Mary herself said of herself, that 'all generations should call her blessed' (Luke i. 48). The Lord in His youth was subject to her (Luke i. 51). At His death, and with His dying accents, He commended her to the care and guardianship of His most devoted and best loved disciple (John xix. 26, 27). We learn of her that she was the first who hearing the blessed teaching of her Son, 'kept all His sayings in her heart' (Luke i. 57). We find her following Him, with unwearied and dauntless affection, to the foot of His Cross (John xix. 25); and, when all but His most faithful followers were dispersed, continuing with the Apostles 'with one accord in prayer and supplication' (Acts i. 14).

All this is but what we should expect. Doubtless among women there never lived a holier than she who was chosen to the highest honour that ever befel created being. That honour, indeed, to be the tabernacle of Incarnate Godhead, to cherish the infant years, minister to the wants, and soothe, if such there were, the early sufferings of the Redeemer of mankind, to be the only earthly instrument by which God wrought the mystery of the Incarnation, is an honour so high,

¹ *Κεχαριτωμένη*. The margin has 'Or, graciously accepted, or, much graced.'

that we can hardly wonder if ages of ignorance gave undue reverence to her who had such favour of God¹.

Yet it has been remarked, that on three separate occasions our Lord and her Lord, used of, and to her, language at least bordering on censure. At the marriage in Cana, the words ‘Woman, what have I to do with thee?’ (John ii. 4), (though not sounding so strong in the Greek as in the English language) have been esteemed in all ages as words of rebuke². Before this, when he was but twelve years old (Luke ii. 49), as His mother and Joseph sought for Him, He reproves them for not knowing the high mission on which He came: ‘How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be about My Father’s business?’ Lastly, when His mother and His brethren sought to speak with Him, the answer to those who told Him of it was, ‘Who are my mother and my brethren? And He stretched forth His hand towards his disciples and said, Behold, my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in Heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother’ (Matt. xii. 48, 49, 50).

Very similar to this was that saying, when a certain woman ‘lifted up her voice and said unto Him, Blessed is the womb that bare Thee, and the paps which Thou hast sucked. But He said, Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God,

¹ ‘Man is a creature of extremes . . . Because Papists have made too much of things, Protestants have made too little of them . . . Because one party has exalted the Virgin Mary to a divinity, the other can scarcely think of that *most highly favoured among women* with common respect.’ *Remains of the Rev. Richard Cecil*, p. 364. Ninth Edition. Lond. 1830.

² *τι ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ γυναῖ*; The word *γυναῖ* may easily be used as a term of respect, and might as well have been rendered ‘lady’ as ‘woman.’ Every one knows that ladies of the highest rank would have been so addressed in Greek. But the fathers all acknowledged rebuke in the sentence. *ἐπίπληττε τῇ μητρί*, says Athanasius (contra. Arian. Orat. 4); *ἐπιτίμησεν ἀκαίρως αἰτούση*, says Chrysostom (in Matt. hom. 45); ‘Ο δὲ ἐπιτιμᾷ αὐτᾷ οὐκ ἀλόγως, says Theophylact. See Beveridge on this Article.

and keep it' (Luke xi. 27, 28). There was indeed no denial of the blessedness of being His mother ; still less was there any denial that His mother was blessed. But the privilege of being the mother of Jesus was not in itself so great as the blessing of doing the will of God. Now those who argue that the Virgin was perfectly free from sin, argue so from the very fact of her being the mother of the Immaculate Saviour. But surely, if the fact of being His mother proved that she was sinless, it would have brought with it, or have been the proof of, a blessing so great that there could have been no room for the 'Yea ! rather blessed.'

We may conclude, therefore, that the Virgin Mary, though 'highly favoured,' 'blessed among women,' and, doubtless, unusually sanctified, was yet no exception to the rule, that all mankind, Christ only excepted, are stained with sin, and liable to offend in many things¹.

¹ The subject of the Perpetual Virginity of the Virgin Mary, which has some affinity to the question discussed in the text, may be seen treated at length by Pearson *On the Creed*, Article, 'Born of the Virgin Mary.' See especially the notes. See also Jer. Taylor's *Life of Christ*, § 2. Bp. Bull's *Works*, Vol. I. Serm. iv.



Works published by John W. Parker,
West Strand, London.

Select List No. I.

By THOMAS MUSGRAVE, D.D., Archbishop of York.

A CHARGE delivered at the Primary Visitation in 1849. Third Edition. 1*s.* 6*d.*

By R. WHATELY, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin.

The Kingdom of Christ. Fourth Edition. 8*s.*

Sermons. Second Edition, with Additions. 12*s.*

The Additional Sermons separately. 2*s.*

On Peculiarities of the Christian Religion. Sixth and Cheaper Edition. Octavo, 7*s.* 6*d.*

On Difficulties in the Writings of the Apostle Paul. Sixth and Cheaper Edition. Octavo, 8*s.*

On the Errors of Romanism having their Origin in Human Nature. Fourth and Cheaper Edition. Octavo, 7*s.* 6*d.*

On Dangers to Christian Faith from the Teaching or the Conduct of its Professors. Second Edition. Octavo, 10*s.*

A Charge delivered at the Visitation in 1849. 1*s.* 6*d.*

By T. VOWLER SHORT, D.D., Bishop of St. Asaph.

History of the Church of England. Fifth Edition. Octavo, 16*s.*

Parochialia. 4*s.*

On the Management of a Parish, and of Sunday Schools, &c., 1*s.*

What is Christianity? Third Edition, 1*s.* 6*d.*

By JOHN GRAHAM, D.D., Bishop of Chester.

A Charge delivered at the Primary Visitation in 1849. Second Edition. 1*s.*

Bishop Pearson's Exposition of the Creed. Revised and Corrected by TEMPLE CHEVALLIER, B.D., Professor of Mathematics in the University of Durham. Edited for the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press. Octavo, 12*s.*

By the late R. MANT, D.D., Lord Bishop of Down and Connor.

History of the Church of Ireland. Two large Volumes, 17s. each.

Primitive Christianity Exemplified by the Primitive Christians.
Octavo, 12s.

Feriæ Anniversariæ: Observance of the Church's Holy-Days.
Symptom of Popery. Two Volumes, 9s.

Religio Quotidiana: Daily Prayer the Law of God's Church, as
heretofore the Practice of Churchmen. 4s. 6d.

Horæ Liturgicæ. 3s. 6d.

Horæ Ecclesiasticæ. 3s. 6d.

By J. C. HARE, M.A., Archdeacon of Lewes.

The True Remedy for the Evils of the Age. A Charge, delivered
in 1849. With Notes, especially on the Educational, Matrimonial, and Bishops'
Questions. Octavo, 3s. 6d.

Parish Sermons. Two Series. Octavo. 12s. each.

Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy Neighbour. A Letter
to the Editor of the English Review. 2s.

Mission of the Comforter. Second Edition. *In the Press.*

The Victory of Faith. Second Edition. 6s.

The Duty of the Church in Times of Trial; a Charge: with
Notes, especially on the Management Clauses of Schools, and on the Jewish Question. 5s.

The Means of Unity; a Charge: with Notes on the Jerusalem
Bishopric, and the Need of an Ecclesiastical Synod. Octavo, 5s.

A Letter to the Dean of Chichester on the Appointment of Dr.
Hampden. Second Edition, with a Postscript, 4s. The Postscript, separately, 2s.

The Unity of the Church; a Sermon. 3s.

The Better Prospects of the Church; a Charge. Octavo. 3s.

Privileges imply Duties; a Charge. 3s.

By F. D. MAURICE, M.A., Professor of Divinity in King's College.

The Prayer Book; specially considered as a Protection against
Romanism. Nineteen Sermons preached at Lincoln's Inn. 5s. 6d.

The Lord's Prayer. Nine Sermons preached at Lincoln's Inn. 2s. 6d.

The Religions of the World, and their Relations to Christianity.
New and Cheaper Edition. 5s.

Lectures on the Epistle to the Hebrews; with a Review of New-
man's Theory of Development. Octavo, 7s. 6d.

Christmas Day, and other Sermons. Octavo. 10s. 6d.

Three Letters to Rev. W. Palmer. 3s.

On Right and Wrong Methods of Supporting Protestantism. 1s.

By R. C. TRENCH, B.D., Professor of Divinity in King's College, London.

Star of the Wise Men; a Commentary on the Second Chapter of St. Matthew. 3s.

Sacred Latin Poetry; selected and arranged for use: with Notes and Introduction. 7s.; or 14s. bound in antique calf.

Notes on the Parables. Fourth Edition, Revised. Octavo, 12s.

Notes on the Miracles. Second Edition, Revised. Octavo, 12s.

The Hulsean Lectures for 1845 and 1846. New Edition, in one Volume, Octavo, 7s. 6d.

Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount, drawn from the Writings of St. Augustine, with Observations. 3s. 6d.

Elegiac Poems. Second Edition. 2s. 6d.

By C. BENSON, M.A., late Master of the Temple.

The Present Mode of Making English Bishops Considered. 1s.

Rubrics and Canons of the Church of England Considered. 1s. 6d.

A Sermon on Galatians, Chap. I. verses 6-12. 1s. 6d.

The Sacrament of Baptism, and Baptismal Regeneration. 4s.

Discourses upon the Powers of the Clergy, Prayers for the Dead, and the Lord's Supper. 6s.

Evidences of Christianity. Fifth Edition. Octavo, 12s.

On Scripture Difficulties. Fourth Edition. Octavo, 12s.

By J. FORSTER, M.A., Her Majesty's Chaplain of the Savoy.

The Gospel-Narrative according to the Authorized Text, without Repetition or Omission. With a Continuous Exposition, Marginal Proofs in full, and Notes. Fourth Edition, 12s.; large paper, 16s.

The Churchman's Guide; an Index of Sermons, and other Works, arranged according to their subjects. Octavo, 7s.

By the Rev. J. E. RIDDLE, M.A.

A Manual of Christian Antiquities. Second Edition. 18s.

Luther and his Times. 5s.

The Churchman's Guide to the Use of the English Liturgy. 3s. 6d.

First Sundays at Church. Fifth Edition. 3s. 6d.

By H. SOAMES, M.A., Chancellor of St. Paul's.

The Anglo-Saxon Church. Third Edition, 10s. 6d.

Elizabethan Religious History. Octavo, 16s.

By W. BATES, B.D., Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge.

College Lectures on Ecclesiastical History. Second Edition. 6s. 6d.

College Lectures on Christian Antiquities, and the Ritual. 9s.

Select List, No. I., of Works

By W. K. CLAY, B.D., Minor Canon of Ely.

Historical Sketch of the Prayer-Book. 1s. 6d.

The Book of Common Prayer Illustrated, so as to show its Modifications, the Date of its several parts, and the Authority on which they rest. 7s. 6d.

Explanatory Notes on the Prayer-Book Version of the Psalms with Copious Marginal References. 7s. 6d.

History of the Christian Church. By the late Prof. BURTON. Eighth and Cheaper Edition. 5s.

History of Christianity. By W. C. TAYLOR, LL.D. 6s. 6d.

On the Early Fathers; a Lecture by Professor BLUNT. 2s.

The Early Christians. By the Rev. W. PRIDDEN, M.A. Fourth Edition. 4s.

The Book of the Fathers, and the Spirit of their Writings. 9s. 6d.

The Church of St. Patrick; an Inquiry into the Independence of the Ancient Church of Ireland. By W. G. TODD, A.B. 4s.

The Civil History of the Jews; from Joshua to Hadrian. By the Rev. O. COCKAYNE, M.A., King's College, London. Second Edition. 4s. 6d.

Burnet's History of the Reformation. The abridgment revised, and Edited by G. E. CORRIE, B.D., Master of Jesus College, Cambridge. 10s. 6d.

In this Edition, the Supplemental Matter added by the Bishop, and which has hitherto existed in a separate Form, has been incorporated into the History; admitted Errors have been corrected; and some changes and Additions made.

A History of the English Reformation. By F. C. MASSINGBERG, M.A., Rector of South Ormsby. A new Edition, Revised and Enlarged. 6s.

An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles, Historical and Doctrinal. By HAROLD BROWNE, M.A., Prebendary of Exeter, and Vicar of Kenwyn, formerly Vice-Principal at Lampeter. The First Volume. Octavo. To be completed in Two Volumes.

A History of Popery, and of its Influence on Society. 9s. 6d.

Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Vindex Catholicus; Treatises, Epistles, and Homilies by the Fathers; Synodal Letters, Canons of Council, &c., in the Original Languages, with Latin Translations, and Indexes. By the Rev. W. W. HARVEY, M.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Complete in Three Volumes, 2l. 15s.

Fullwood's Roma Ruit. The Pillars of Rome broken: wherein all the several Pleas for the Pope's Authority in England, with all the material Defences of them, are revised and answered. A New Edition, by C. HARDWICK, M.A. Octavo. 10s. 6d.

Wilson's Illustration of the Method of explaining the New Testament by the Early Opinions of Jews and Christians concerning Christ. Edited by T. TURTON, D.D., Lord Bishop of Ely. A New Edition, revised, 8s.

Rituale Anglo Catholicum; or, The Testimony of the Catholic Church to the Book of Common Prayer, exhibited by the Fathers, Councils, Liturgies, and Rituals. By H. BAILEY, M.A., Warden of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury. Octavo, 15s.

Twysden's Historical Vindication of the Church of England in point of Schism. Edited for the Syndics of the Cambridge Press, with the Author's MS. Additions, by the Rev. Professor CORRIE, Master of Jesus College, Cambridge. Octavo, 7s. 6d.

Ussher's Answer to a Jesuit, with other Tracts on Popery. 13s. 6d.

The Ministry of St. John the Baptist, and the Baptism and Temptation of the Lord Jesus Christ. An Essay upon the First Three Gospels. By E. HUXTABLE, B.A., Vice Principal of the Wells Theological College. Octavo, 4s. 6d.

The Harmony of the Apocalypse with other Prophecies of Holy Scripture. With Notes, and an Outline of the various Interpretations. By W. H. HOARE, M.A., late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. Royal Octavo, 10s.

Lectures on the Prophecies, proving the Divine Origin of Christianity. By A. McCAUL, D.D., Professor of Divinity in King's College, London. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Twenty-five Village Sermons. By C. KINGSLEY, jun., Rector of Eversley. 5s.

College Chapel Sermons. By W. WHEWELL, D.D., Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. Octavo, 10s. 6d.

Two Series of Discourses. I. On Christian Humiliation. II. On the City of God. By C. H. TERROT, D.D., Bishop of Edinburgh. Octavo, 7s. 6d.

The Liturgy as it is, illustrated in a Series of Practical Sermons. By H. HOWARTH, B.D., Rector of St. George, Hanover Square. Second Edition. 4s. 6d.

Sermons. By J. O. W. HAWEIS, M.A., Morning Preacher at the Magdalen Hospital. 5s. 6d.

Practical Sermons, by Dignitaries and other Clergymen. Edited by J. C. CROSTHWAIT, M.A., Rector of St. Mary-at-Hill. Three Volumes, Octavo, 7s. each.

Butler's Three Sermons on Human Nature, and Dissertation on Virtue. With Preface and Syllabus, by W. WHEWELL, D.D. Second Edition. 3s. 6d.

Butler's Six Sermons on Moral Subjects. With Preface and Syllabus. By DR. WHEWELL. 3s. 6d.

The Choral Service of the United Church of England and Ireland. By JOHN JEBB, M.A., Rector of Peterstow. Octavo, 16s.

Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford. By C. A. OGILVIE, D.D., Canon of Christ Church. Octavo, 5s.

An Inquiry into the Catholic Truths Hidden under the Articles Peculiar to the Creed of the Church of Rome. By C. SMITH, B.D., Rector of Newton. Part I., 6s. Part II., 4s.

The Scriptural Character of the English Church considered. With Notes. By D. COLERIDGE, M.A., Principal of St. Mark's College. Octavo, 12s. 6d.

Short Sermons for Children, illustrative of the Catechism and Liturgy. By the Rev. C. A. JOHNS, B.A. 3s. 6d.

The Calling of a Medical Student; Four Sermons preached at King's College, London. By E. H. PLUMPTRE, M.A., Chaplain and Divinity Lecturer. 12s.

An Exposition of the First Seventeen Articles of the Church of England. By T. SWORDE, M.A., Rector of St. Peter's, Thetford. Octavo, 7s.

The Literature of the Church of England, exhibited in Specimens of the Writings of Eminent Divines, with Memoirs of their Lives, and Historical Sketches of the Times in which they lived. By R. CATTERMOLLE, B.D. Two Volumes, Octavo, 5s.

The Ritual of the United Church of England and Ireland Illustrated; with Reference to the Objections of Dissenters. By G. W. TYRRELL, A.M. 6s.

The Book of Psalms, newly Translated from the Hebrew, with Critical and Philological Notes. By the late W. FRENCH, D.D., Master of Jesus College, Cambridge, and G. SKINNER, M.A. New Edition. 12s.

James's Treatise on the Corruption of Scripture, Councils, and Fathers, by the Prelates, Pastors, and Pillars of the Church of Rome. Revised and Corrected by J. E. COX, M.A. Octavo, 12s.

The Churchman's Theological Dictionary. By ROBERT EDEN, M.A., Chaplain to the Bishop of Norwich. Second Edition, 5s.

The design of this Work is to give plain and simple explanations of the Theological and Ecclesiastical terms which are used in describing and discussing religious Ordinances, Doctrines, and Institutions, without entering into the controversies which have arisen respecting their object and import.

The Statutes relating to the Ecclesiastical and Eleemosynary Institutions of England, Wales, Ireland, India, and the Colonies; with the Decisions thereon. By A. J. STEPHENS, M.A., F.R.S., Barrister-at-Law. Two large Volumes, Royal Octavo, with copious Indices, 3l. 3s. Bound in law calf, 3l. 13s. 6d.

Ecclesiastical Architecture in Great Britain. Edited by H. BOWMAN. Illustrated by Views, Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details. Royal Quarto, 2l. 5s. or in Twelve Parts, at 3s. 6d. each.

Life of Archbishop Ussher, with an Account of his Writings. By C. R. ELINGTON, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, Dublin. Portrait. Octavo. 12s.

By R. A. WILLMOTT, Incumbent of St. Catherine, Bear Wood.

Journal of Summer Time in the Country. 5s.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor; his Predecessors, Contemporaries, and Successors. A Biography. Second Edition, 5s.

Lives of English Sacred Poets. Two Volumes, with Portraits, 4s. 6d. each.

Bishop Heber and Indian Missions. By J. CHAMBERS, M.A. 2s. 6d.

Lives of Eminent Christians. By R. B. HONE, M.A., Archdeacon of Worcester. Four Volumes, with Portraits, 4s. 6d. each.

The First Volume contains the Lives of Archbishop Ussher, Dr. Hammond, Evelyn, and Bishop Wilson; the Second, Bernard Gilpin, Philip de Mornay, Bishop Bedell, and A. Horneck; the Third, Bishop Ridley, Bishop Hall, and Robert Boyle; the Fourth, John Bradford, Archbishop Grindal, and Judge Hale.

Life of Archbishop Sancroft. By the late Dr. D'O'LY. Octavo. 9s.

Memoirs of the Life, Character, and Writings, of Bishop Butler. By T. BARTLETT, M.A., Rector of Kingstone. Octavo, 12s. with a Portrait.

Cudworth on Freewill; now first Edited, with Notes, by J. ALLEN, M.A., Archdeacon of Salop. 3s.

Garrick's Mode of Reading the Liturgy. With Notes, and a Discourse on Public Reading. By R. CULL, Tutor in Elocution. Octavo, 5s. 6d.

Ordo Sæclorum; a Treatise on the Chronology of the Holy Scriptures. By H. BROWNE, M.A., Canon of Chichester. Octavo, 20s.

Dr. HEY's Lectures in Divinity, delivered in the University of Cambridge. A New Edition, Two Volumes, Octavo, 30s.

Comments upon the Epistles, for the Sundays, Fasts, and Holy-days. By J. F. HONE, M.A., Vicar of Tirley. 6s.

The Ministration of Public Baptism of Infants, and the Form of receiving Children who have been privately baptized, arranged as one Service. 1s. 6d.

Office for the Visitation of the Sick; with Notes and Explanations, by the late Archdeacon COXE. 1s. 6d.

Paley's Evidences Epitomized, by J. W. SMITH, B.C.L. With Examination Questions. 3s.

An Index to Butler's Analogy, prepared by Dr. Bentham, and corrected by Bishop Butler. By T. BARTLETT, M.A. 2s. 6d.

Examination Questions upon Burnet on the Articles. 1s. 6d.

Examination Questions upon Butler's Analogy. By the Rev. Sir G. W. CRAUFURD, Bart., M.A. 1s. 6d.

Bible Maps; a Series of new and accurate Maps, with Explanatory Memoirs, and Index of Scriptural and Modern Names. By W. HUGHES. 7s. 6d.

Scriptural Breviates; Short Compendiums of Scriptural Instruction, according to the Doctrines and Discipline of the Church of England and Ireland.

Class A. An Introductory Manual to the Reading and Study of the Holy Scriptures. 4s. in Cloth, or in a Wrapper, 3s.

Class K. Short Compendiums of Faith and Practice for the Sick. 2s. in Cloth, or in a Wrapper, 1s.

8 **Select Works published by John W. Parker.**

Edited by JOHN HULLAH, Professor of Vocal Music in King's College.

The Psalter, or Psalms of David in Metre, with appropriate Tunes; in Score, with or without Accompaniments, and in separate Volumes for the Four Voices. A Descriptive Catalogue of the different Editions may be had of the Publisher.

Psalm Tune-Books, without Words, containing Eighty-two Tunes from the PSALTER.

Harmonized for **THREE EQUAL VOICES, 2s. 6d.**

Harmonized for **FOUR VOICES, (Soprano, Alto, Tenor, and Bass,) 3s.**

The Whole Book of Psalms, with the Canticles and Hymns of the Church, for Morning and Evening Service, set to appropriate Chants, every Syllable being placed under its proper Note. Octavo, 15s.

Chants with the Gregorian Tones, without Words. 1s.

Sacred Minstrelsy; Sacred Music by the Great Masters, arranged as Solos and Concerted Pieces, with Accompaniments for the Pianoforte and Organ. In handsome Folio Volumes, half-bound Morocco, 2l. 2s.

Sacra Domestica; a Course of Family Prayers. Printed in large type, with provision for additions in MS. Octavo, 3s.

The Book of Private Prayer. By J. A. BOLSTER, M.A., Prebendary of Cork, and Chaplain to the Lord Bishop. 2s., gilt.

A Manual of Family Prayer; comprising Three Weekly Courses of Morning and Evening Devotion. By the Rev. A. HORSFALL. 2s.

A Daily Prayer Book for Families and Schools; arranged from the Services of the Church. By J. T. BARRETT, D.D., Rector of Attleburgh. 1s. 6d.

Christmas Carols, with Accompaniments. Small Quarto, 4s.

Liber Precum Publicarum; Ordo Administrandæ Coenæ Domini. Catechismus, Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ. Psalterium. Royal 24mo, printed with red border lines. 5s. 6d. in cloth; 10s. 6d. in antique calf, red edges.

This volume exhibits the Authentic Latin of our present Prayer-Book, the arrangement of which has been carefully preserved.

The Morning and Evening Services for the Sundays and other Holidays throughout the Year; arranged from the *Book of Common Prayer*.

In these Editions, separate volumes are devoted to the Morning and Evening Services respectively. The order of the *Book of Common Prayer* is strictly observed, with the addition of the First and Second Lessons for every Sunday and Holiday throughout the year, printed at full in their appointed order. By this means the Morning (or the Evening) Service, in a complete and continuous form, is wholly comprised in one volume.

TWO VOLUMES.	Foolscap Octavo.			Royal Thirty-Two.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Boards	0	14	0	0	7	0
Roan Embossed, Gilt Edges	0	15	0	0	7	6
Turkey Morocco, Plain	0	18	0	0	10	0
Flexible Morocco, Fine	1	1	0	0	12	6
Flexible Morocco, Elegant	1	6	0	0	16	0





